All Models Are Idols: Iconoclasm, Apophatic Humility, and the Refusal of Conceptual Possession

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

January 3, 2026

Modern people do not only worship statues; they worship explanations. A model promises closure: a finite object that stands in for reality, compresses it, predicts it, and—quietly—claims the right to speak last. This paper advances an intentionally severe thesis: all models are structurally idolatrous. Not merely because models can be misused, but because representation itself invites possession. The heart reaches for a handle on what cannot be held—God, being, meaning, even creation's fullness—and the handle becomes a substitute. In this sense, every model is a golden calf: an artifact of the mind that offers control, certainty, and a counterfeit peace. We develop this claim in two registers. First, an apophatic register: God cannot be modeled without reduction, and any attempt to capture ultimacy in concept-form becomes a rival authority. Second, a practical register: since humans cannot live without some representation, we describe a "repentant instrument-use" posture—treating models like fire, permitted only under confession, renunciation, strict anti-ultimacy vows, and fruit-based discernment. The aim is not anti-intellectualism, but spiritual honesty: refusing conceptual sovereignty so that reverence, obedience, and living truth remain upstream of every map.

Keywords: idolatry, models, iconoclasm, apophatic theology, negative theology, conceptual possession, scientism, epistemic humility, no-ultimacy rule, no-oracle rule, renunciation, provisionality, instrumental use, fruit test, metaphysics, theology of creation, limits of representation, silence, discernment, worship of explanations.

A collaboration with GPT-5.2-Thinking. 58 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: The Age of Explanation as Worship
1.1 From carved images to conceptual images
1.2 The central claim: modelhood as structural idolatry
1.3 What this paper is and is not: severity without anti-intellectualism
1.4 Terms and scope: “model,” “idol,” “ultimacy,” “possession”

2. What a Model Is, Spiritually Speaking
2.1 Representation as compression: why maps seduce
2.2 Closure as counterfeit peace: the emotional payoff of “having it”
2.3 Authority drift: how tools become judges
2.4 The hidden liturgy of modernity: prediction, control, and reassurance

3. The Apophatic Argument: Why God Cannot Be Modeled
3.1 God as living reality, not an object among objects
3.2 The reduction problem: every concept subtracts
3.3 Negative theology as discipline: saying what God is not
3.4 The idol test: when concepts claim the right to terminate mystery
3.5 Prayer and worship as anti-model practices

4. The “All Models” Escalation: Creation Cannot Be Possessed Either
4.1 The world exceeds our frames: why total representation is impossible
4.2 The temptation to replace witness with mastery
4.3 Scientific models as exemplary idols: the prestige of quantified closure
4.4 Political and moral models: the idol of the system that explains people
4.5 The pastoral danger: despair and pride born from false totalities

5. The Self-Incrimination Problem and How Iconoclasm Survives It
5.1 “All models are idols” as a model-claim
5.2 Two ways through: absolute iconoclasm vs repentant instrument-use
5.3 Confessional speech: speaking while denying possession
5.4 The logic of renunciation: using words without enthroning them

6. Absolute Iconoclasm: The Hard, Pure Path
6.1 The ethic of silence: restraint as reverence
6.2 Minimal speech: testimony, confession, and refusal of system-building
6.3 The costs: coordination, teaching, and practical life
6.4 The risks: performative purity, hidden pride, and sectarian brittleness

7. Repentant Instrument-Use: Models as Emergency Tools Under Vow
7.1 Why humans cannot live without representations

7.2 The fire doctrine: models are useful, but never embraceable
7.3 The vow set: no-ultimacy, no-oracle, no-worship, revision, humility
7.4 The humility clause: every model must carry an explicit confession of limits
7.5 The fruit test: how to tell when a model has become an idol

8. Case Study: Cosmology and the Worship of Explanations
8.1 Dark matter and "bookkeeping" as a seduction toward ontological closure
8.2 CMB inference as a prestige engine: when spectra become sermons
8.3 The category error: from constrained fit to godless worldview
8.4 A disciplined refusal: what can be said without enthroning the model

9. Case Study: Moral and Political Models as Idols
9.1 When a framework replaces a person
9.2 Predictive governance and the idol of legibility
9.3 Scapegoat models: systems that require victims to stay coherent
9.4 Repair discipline: restoring persons above explanations

10. Practices of Anti-Idolatrous Knowing
10.1 Liturgies of humility: prayer, confession, thanksgiving, repentance
10.2 Epistemic fasting: periodic abstention from explanatory closure
10.3 Community constraints: accountability against private certainty
10.4 The discipline of testimony: witness over system
10.5 The discipline of wonder: awe without capture

11. Objections and Replies
11.1 "This is anti-science"
11.2 "This collapses into incoherence"
11.3 "Christianity itself has doctrines—aren't those models?"
11.4 "Without models we cannot act"
11.5 "This is just another form of pride"

12. Conclusion: The Refusal of Conceptual Sovereignty
12.1 Restating the thesis in one paragraph
12.2 What is gained: reverence, moral clarity, freedom from false closure
12.3 What is risked: impracticality, miscommunication, performative purity
12.4 Forward work: a disciplined Reference section and further case studies

References
Art

1. Introduction: The Age of Explanation as Worship

We live in a time that mistrusts incense but trusts inference. The old idols were visible: carved figures, gilded objects, sacred groves, state banners, temples built to local gods. The new idols are less obvious because they look like competence. They appear as charts, models, frameworks, simulations, dashboards, "the science," and the promise that reality can be reduced to a manageable description. This paper argues that the modern hunger for total explanation has become a substitute liturgy: a disciplined practice of seeking closure, control, and reassurance through representation. The claim is not that measurement is evil or that thought is forbidden, but that the human heart is predisposed to convert a tool into a throne. In an era where explanation is the highest prestige, the temptation is to worship the explanatory artifact itself, treating it as the final authority over what exists, what matters, and what can be hoped for. The result is a subtle but pervasive form of idolatry: the enthronement of a finite model as if it were ultimate truth.

This introduction sets the tone and the guardrails. The tone is intentionally severe, because the idol problem is severe. The guardrails are equally firm, because severity can slip into anti-intellectualism, performative purity, or merely another model pretending to be above models. The goal is to articulate a disciplined iconoclasm that does not confuse humility with stupidity, silence with emptiness, or reverence with refusal to learn. We will treat "models" not primarily as technical objects, but as spiritual objects: artifacts of representation that invite conceptual possession. We will also treat "idolatry" not primarily as primitive superstition, but as a perennial temptation: replacing living reality with a controllable substitute. The first task is to say what we mean.

1.1 From carved images to conceptual images

A carved image is not dangerous because it is made of wood or stone. It is dangerous because it offers a handle. It says: "Here is the god. Here is the manageable form. Here is the object you can keep, move, display, and consult." It makes ultimacy portable. It invites ownership.

Conceptual images function the same way, but with a crucial upgrade: they can be shared at scale while remaining invisible as idols. A theory can be carried in the mind, repeated in classrooms, institutionalized in journals, encoded in software, and deployed in policy. It can command obedience without incense. It can feel humble ("we just follow the data") while exercising enormous authority. It can offer salvation of a modern kind: reduction of anxiety through closure.

This is why explanation can become worship. Worship is not only singing; it is also trust, submission, and ultimacy. When people say, "This model tells us what is real," and then treat dissent as heresy; when they say, "This framework ends the question," and then treat mystery

as ignorance; when they say, “This system is how the world works,” and then treat persons as mere instances of a schema—then the conceptual image has become a functional idol. It is not necessary for anyone to say “I worship it.” Worship is visible in what is treated as final.

The transition from carved to conceptual images is therefore not a move from superstition to enlightenment. It is often a move from crude idols to sophisticated idols: idols that appear rational, benevolent, and inevitable. The modern idol does not look like a statue. It looks like a closed world-picture.

1.2 The central claim: modelhood as structural idolatry

The central claim of this paper is stronger than “models can become idols.” It is: modelhood is structurally idolatrous. A model is, by nature, a finite representation that stands in for reality. It compresses. It abstracts. It filters. It turns the living richness of being into a manageable object for cognition and action. That is its purpose. And that purpose is exactly what makes it spiritually perilous.

Why “structural”? Because the danger is not an accident at the margins. The danger follows from what a model is:

- A model makes reality legible by excluding most of it.
- A model produces confidence by stabilizing what is unstable.
- A model offers power by turning description into prediction and prediction into control.
- A model offers emotional relief by replacing open-ended encounter with closed-form explanation.

The idol is born when that relief is taken for truth. The human heart wants not merely to understand but to possess. “To possess” here does not mean physical ownership; it means conceptual sovereignty: the feeling that one has a final grip on what is, so that one no longer needs to tremble, repent, ask, or wait. A model invites that feeling because it feels like a completed object. It feels like something one can hold.

If God is living, personal, and unbounded, then modeling God is reduction by definition. But the claim goes further: even creation cannot be fully possessed. The world exceeds our frames. The moment we treat our frame as the world, we exchange encounter for mastery. That exchange is not neutral. It is a spiritual shift: from reverence to domination, from worship to management, from confession to control. In that sense, every model is a ready-made golden calf: the heart can enthrone it even while the mouth insists it is “just a tool.”

This is not a call to ignorance. It is a diagnosis of temptation.

1.3 What this paper is and is not: severity without anti-intellectualism

This paper is severe because it is about a severe spiritual disease: the substitution of artifacts for ultimacy. But severity is not the same as contempt for intellect. There is a difference between refusing idolatry and refusing thought. This section makes the boundary explicit.

What this paper is:

- A critique of the will-to-closure, the desire to end reality with a schema.
- A diagnosis of how representation becomes authority and authority becomes worship.
- A defense of apophatic humility: the disciplined refusal to convert concept into god.
- A proposal of practices that keep human knowing under God rather than above being.

What this paper is not:

- Not a denial that models can be locally useful.
- Not a claim that measurement is deception or that all inference is arbitrary.
- Not a call to abandon medicine, engineering, or ordinary prudence.
- Not a romantic celebration of confusion, irrationality, or anti-scientific resentment.

The point is not "thinking is sin." The point is: thinking becomes sin when it claims sovereignty. The intellect is not the enemy; enthroned intellect is. Models are not the enemy; models as ultimate judges are. In fact, this paper assumes that careful thinking is part of obedience: to tell the truth, to avoid false witness, to be precise about what we know and what we do not know. The severity is aimed at a specific spiritual move: turning limited maps into final realities.

There is also a second danger: iconoclasm can become its own pride. "I reject all models" can become an identity that functions like—again—a model. That is why we will distinguish two postures later: absolute iconoclasm (silence and refusal) and repentant instrument-use (minimal modeling under vow). Both acknowledge the structural idolatry risk; they differ in how they manage human necessity.

1.4 Terms and scope: "model," "idol," "ultimacy," "possession"

Because this paper operates at the boundary between epistemology and spiritual discipline, the terms must be explicit.

Model: A finite representation that stands in for some domain of reality for the purpose of description, prediction, coordination, or control. A model can be mathematical, verbal, visual, statistical, narrative, institutional, or procedural. A "framework" is a model. A "theory of

everything" is a model. A "personality type system" is a model. A "political theory" is a model. A "mental picture of God" can function as a model. The common feature is substitution: the model becomes an object that can be handled.

Idol: A finite object (physical or conceptual) that is treated as ultimate in authority, trust, or final explanation. An idol is not defined by its material. It is defined by its role. When a model is treated as the last word, it becomes an idol even if everyone insists it is "just science" or "just common sense." Idolatry is the act of granting ultimacy to what is not ultimate.

Ultimacy: The right to terminate questions. The right to define what is real. The right to set the boundary of possibility and meaning. Ultimacy is the seat of worship. In a Christian frame, ultimacy belongs to God alone. Any created thing that claims it—whether statue or theory—competes with God's rightful place.

Possession: Conceptual sovereignty over reality, experienced as "I have it." Possession is not merely knowing something; it is knowing in a way that suppresses humility. It is the conversion of understanding into ownership. Possession is the psychological and spiritual payoff models tend to offer: the sense of closure, mastery, immunity from mystery, and reduced dependence on God.

Scope: This paper does not attempt to adjudicate every scientific claim. It is not a technical cosmology paper. It is a spiritual-epistemic paper using cosmology (and other domains) as case studies for a broader diagnosis: the idol-making tendency of representation. The argument is framed to be applicable across domains: science, politics, morality, and even theology, because the temptation to enthrone our own constructions is not limited to secular people. The idol factory is human, not merely modern.

With these terms in place, the paper can now proceed: first to show how models seduce and claim authority, then to show why God cannot be modeled without reduction, then to propose a disciplined way of living and speaking that refuses conceptual sovereignty.

2. What a Model Is, Spiritually Speaking

A model is often introduced as something modest: "a simplified description," "a map of the territory," "a useful approximation." Spiritually, however, a model is never only a technical object. It is a psychological and moral object. It is a human artifact that sits at the intersection of fear and desire: fear of uncertainty, desire for mastery; fear of dependence, desire for self-sufficiency; fear of mystery, desire for closure. That is why models are not neutral. They shape what we expect from reality and, more quietly, what we expect from God.

To speak spiritually about models is to ask a different question than "does the model predict well?" It is to ask: what does the model do to the soul? What posture does it cultivate? Does it train humility or does it train sovereignty? Does it keep encounter alive or does it replace encounter with substitution? A model is a compression device, yes—but it is also an altar candidate. The same features that make it useful also make it spiritually dangerous.

This section lays out four features of modelhood that account for its seduction and its tendency toward idolatry: compression, closure, authority drift, and modernity's hidden liturgy of prediction and control.

2.1 Representation as compression: why maps seduce

All representation compresses. A map throws away almost everything about a place—smell, wind, lived history, the sound of gravel, the small humiliations and joys of travel—and retains only what a traveler thinks they need: distances, boundaries, routes. The map is therefore "false" in the trivial sense that it is not the territory; it is also "true" in the practical sense that it can guide your steps. The spiritual danger begins when the map's usefulness is mistaken for ontological authority.

Compression seduces because it feels like victory. Reality is complex, chaotic, uncontrollable. Compression converts that threatening complexity into something graspable. It produces a small object that can be held in the mind. The mind experiences this as relief, and relief is addictive. When the relief is accompanied by social prestige ("you understand the system"), the seduction deepens. The model becomes not merely a tool but a badge of belonging to the initiated.

Compression also seduces because it flatters the human preference for tractable worlds. A model grants legibility: the sense that the world can be read like a text, decoded like a puzzle, or optimized like a machine. Legibility is not evil; it is part of human vocation to name and steward. But legibility becomes a spiritual trap when it is taken as the final mode of relation to reality. Not everything that exists is meant to be optimized, and not everything that matters is legible. Persons, for example, are partially legible and yet irreducible. God is not legible in the sense a mechanism is legible. The model's seduction is that it offers a universal solvent: "If we can model it, we can know it; if we can know it, we can manage it."

At a deeper level, compression is a form of exclusion. Every model "knows" by discarding. It says: ignore this, neglect that, treat this as noise, treat that as constant. Spiritually, this is where idolatry can begin to hide. Because we can discard the wrong things. We can discard moral depth as "subjective." We can discard mystery as "ignorance." We can discard prayer as "non-informative." We can discard repentance as "psychological." We can discard God as "unnecessary for the mechanism." The model does not force these discards, but it provides a

structure in which they feel reasonable and mature. The tool becomes the justification for metaphysical amputation.

2.2 Closure as counterfeit peace: the emotional payoff of "having it"

The most dangerous aspect of a model is not its abstraction. It is the emotional payoff: closure. Closure feels like peace. But closure is often a counterfeit peace, because it is achieved by ending questions rather than by receiving truth.

"HAVING IT" is a particular interior sensation: the sense that the world is now safe because it is explainable. It does not necessarily mean you have evidence; it means you have a story. It means your anxiety has been reduced. It means the threat of open-ended reality has been tamed. The model becomes a psychological shelter.

This is where idolatry becomes plausible even for intelligent people. Idolatry is often treated as stupidity: "how could someone worship a statue?" But the statue is not worshiped as wood; it is worshiped as a source of stability. Modern idolatry is the same: people do not worship equations as ink; they worship them as closure. An explanatory framework can become the thing that provides a sense of security, identity, and control. It can become the thing you consult when afraid, the thing you quote when challenged, the thing you trust when reality bites back.

Counterfeit peace is especially seductive when it wears the clothing of humility. "We just go where the model leads." "We just follow the science." "We just accept the data." These phrases can be sincere. They can also mask a deep desire not for truth but for relief. Real truth often destabilizes before it stabilizes. Real truth often requires repentance. Counterfeit peace asks for none of that. It says: accept the frame, and you can stop trembling.

There is also a communal version of counterfeit peace: a shared model becomes a shared refuge. It reduces conflict by defining what counts as real. It produces unity by narrowing reality to what fits the consensus. This is why ideologies function like religions. Their internal coherence feels like salvation. Their ability to explain everything becomes their proof. The more they explain, the more they feel true. But explanation density is not truth. It is only compression power. The idol's hallmark is that it gives you a sense of completion that reality has not granted.

2.3 Authority drift: how tools become judges

Authority drift is the process by which a model quietly changes jobs. It begins as an instrument—something used to serve human aims within a defined scope. Over time it becomes an arbiter—something that decides what is real and what is not, what is rational and what is not, what is permitted to be discussed and what must be dismissed.

This drift happens through small steps:

- First, the model is treated as “the best current explanation.”
- Then it becomes “the only serious explanation.”
- Then dissent becomes “ignorance” rather than “alternative interpretation.”
- Then phenomena that do not fit become “not real,” or “not important,” or “not scientific.”
- Finally, the model becomes a gatekeeper: it decides what questions are allowed.

The model’s authority can grow because it delivers real success in limited domains. Engineering works. Medicine works. Prediction works sometimes. Those successes are real. The danger is that success in a bounded domain is used to justify sovereignty over all domains. A model that helps you build bridges is not thereby licensed to explain love. A model that predicts particle behavior is not thereby licensed to declare that moral law is an illusion. Yet this is exactly how modern idol-making proceeds: the tool’s genuine competence is leveraged into metaphysical dominion.

Authority drift also occurs because institutions reward it. Funding, publication, prestige, and careers form around dominant models. This is not always corrupt; it is how coordinated work happens. But coordination has a dark side: it turns a framework into an orthodoxy, and orthodoxy into a priesthood. Then the model begins to function like an idol not because it is false but because it is enthroned. People defend it the way people defend sacred things: not with curiosity, but with boundary policing. The model becomes a judge.

Spiritually, this drift is decisive. When a model is treated as judge, it begins to command trust and submission. It becomes the place where ultimacy is assigned. And once ultimacy is assigned, worship has begun in functional terms—even if the worshiper insists they are merely being rational.

2.4 The hidden liturgy of modernity: prediction, control, and reassurance

Modernity has its liturgy. It does not call it that, because “liturgy” sounds religious, and modernity often wants to be the religion that denies religion. But liturgy is simply repeated practice that forms desire and shapes what we treat as ultimate. In that sense, modern life is saturated with liturgy: metrics dashboards, forecasting, optimization, recommendation systems, risk models, performance indicators, and the constant demand to convert uncertainty into manageable plans.

The hidden liturgy goes like this:

- The world is a system.
- Systems can be modeled.
- What can be modeled can be predicted.
- What can be predicted can be controlled.
- What can be controlled can be made safe.
- Therefore safety comes from mastery.

This is not always stated, but it is enacted. We rehearse it daily. We are trained to feel anxious when something cannot be predicted. We are trained to feel empowered when a dashboard lights up green. We are trained to treat mystery as a defect. We are trained to treat dependence as weakness. And then, quietly, we are trained to treat God as unnecessary because God is not a controllable variable in the system.

The liturgy's goal is reassurance. Its sacrament is the successful forecast. Its priesthood is the class of model-makers. Its confessional is the postmortem. Its absolution is the revised model. Its eschatology is a future of total management: enough data, enough compute, enough policy, enough surveillance, enough optimization, and fear will end.

This is where the spiritual critique becomes sharpest. The Christian story says peace is not finally achieved by control. Peace is received from God, given through reconciliation, and sustained through faith, obedience, and love. Modernity's liturgy says peace is achieved by mastery. That is why models are so easily enthroned: they are the instruments of mastery.

To name this as liturgy is not to mock science. It is to unmask a rival gospel that piggybacks on science's real achievements. Science can be a legitimate act of exploration within creation. But when its practices become the route to existential reassurance—when prediction and control replace worship and trust—then the model is no longer merely a tool. It is participating in a spiritual formation that aims at a godless peace.

This section therefore prepares the next move of the paper: if modelhood is structurally seductive, and if modernity's habits intensify that seduction, then a purely technical conversation about "accuracy" will never be enough. What is required is discipline: explicit renunciation of ultimacy, and practices that keep explanation from becoming worship.

3. The Apophatic Argument: Why God Cannot Be Modeled

If the claim "all models are structurally idolatrous" sounds excessive, it becomes less excessive when applied to God. Here the problem is not merely psychological; it is logical and theological. Any model is a finite representation. God, in classical Christian confession, is not finite. God is not one being among beings, one item among items, one cause among causes, one force inside the universe. God is the Creator of all that exists, the ground of being, the One in whom we live and move and have our being. In that frame, to "model" God is not like modeling a star or a cell. It is to treat the uncreated as if He were created, and to treat the living God as if He were an object available for management.

Apophatic theology (negative theology) is not a romantic preference for vagueness. It is a discipline of reverence. It is the refusal to allow the mind's representations to become substitutes for God. It insists that our language about God must be both true and chastened: true enough to confess and obey, chastened enough to avoid conceptual capture. The argument is not that God is unknowable, but that God is not knowable by possession. God is known by encounter, covenant, obedience, and worship—not by reducing Him to a conceptual object that fits inside our mental inventory.

This section lays out why modeling God is structurally prone to idolatry: because God is living reality, because concepts subtract, because apophatic speech is a necessary restraint, because we need an "idol test" for conceptual closure, and because prayer and worship enact a non-possessive mode of knowing.

3.1 God as living reality, not an object among objects

The first apophatic claim is not "God is vague." It is "God is not an object." In Scripture, God is personal, speaking, commanding, judging, forgiving, sustaining. He is the Lord, not a component. That already blocks the modeling impulse. A model requires a stable object that can be represented and manipulated. But the living God is not available for manipulation, and He is not adequately represented by any finite schema.

To call God "living reality" is to insist on several things at once:

- God is not reducible to properties that can be listed.
- God is not contained in a definition.
- God is not exhausted by a set of propositions.
- God is not a topic we master; God is the One before whom we are mastered.

Even the grammar changes. In ordinary modeling, the subject is the human mind and the object is the world. In worship, God is the subject and we are the addressed. God is not merely

“known”; He is the One who knows. God is not merely “described”; He is the One who speaks. This reverses the posture of sovereignty. Modeling keeps sovereignty with the human; worship returns sovereignty to God.

A model of God therefore tends to invert the relationship. It makes God fit the human frame rather than making the human submit to God’s revelation. This is why biblical polemic against idolatry is not primarily about aesthetic error, but about covenantal treason: replacing the living God with a manageable substitute. The apophatic argument is a way of obeying that polemic at the level of concepts.

3.2 The reduction problem: every concept subtracts

Every concept subtracts. That is not a defect; it is how concepts work. A concept isolates a feature, separates it from the whole, and names it. This allows communication and thought. But it also produces distortion if you forget what you have done.

When applied to God, subtraction becomes dangerous quickly. If you say “God is love,” you have said something true and yet dangerously compressive. Because “love” in human language carries connotations that can be sentimental, permissive, or merely emotional. If you say “God is judge,” you have said something true and yet dangerously compressive, because “judge” can be heard as cold, legalistic, or merely punitive. If you say “God is power,” you risk collapsing God into force. If you say “God is reason,” you risk collapsing God into a principle. Each statement can be orthodox, and each can become a reduction that misleads.

The reduction problem is not solved by multiplying concepts. A longer list of attributes is still a finite list. It can become a more elaborate idol. The mind can build a cathedral of concepts and worship inside it.

At the root is a simple mismatch: a finite representation cannot contain infinite reality. The moment you treat your representation as containment, you have replaced God with your idea of God. And ideas are safe; God is not safe. Ideas are manageable; God is Lord. Ideas do not judge you; God does. The reduction problem thus has spiritual force: concepts can become shields against the living God. They allow a person to speak about God while avoiding God.

The apophatic discipline does not forbid positive confession. It forbids the quiet shift from confession to possession. It reminds us: every concept is a finger pointing, not the thing pointed to. Every concept is a witness, not a capture. Every concept must remain under judgment by God’s self-disclosure, and under repentance when it hardens into certainty that displaces trust.

3.3 Negative theology as discipline: saying what God is not

Negative theology is often misunderstood as a refusal to say anything. That is not its primary function. Its function is to prevent false positives: to refuse to treat creaturely categories as if they could describe God without remainder.

At its simplest, apophatic speech says:

- God is not a thing.
- God is not contained by space.
- God is not limited by time.
- God is not dependent.
- God is not measurable.
- God is not one cause among causes.

These are not meant to erase God. They are meant to purify our thinking so that when we speak positively—Creator, Father, Lord, Holy, Good—we do not secretly mean "a bigger version of a creature."

Apophatic discipline is a guard against anthropomorphic projection. Humans are drawn to make God into an amplified human. That may feel intimate, but it can become blasphemous: God reduced to our psychological needs. Apophatic restraint says: no, God is not like that. God is beyond our categories, even when He graciously uses human language to reveal Himself.

This discipline also protects against a subtler idolatry: metaphysical domestication. A person can reduce God to "a principle," "the ground of ethics," "the ultimate explanation," "the universe's consciousness," or "the highest value." These may sound elevated. They can also be reductions that avoid repentance. Negative theology says: God is not your principle. God is not your explanatory stop sign. God is not your system's keystone. God is God.

In Christian terms, apophatic theology is also paired with God's self-revelation. We do not climb into knowledge of God by intellectual conquest. We receive what God reveals. The apophatic "no" is not a refusal of revelation; it is a refusal of self-authorized capture.

3.4 The idol test: when concepts claim the right to terminate mystery

If models are idol-prone, we need a practical test. The idol test here is not "does the concept sound religious?" It is "what does the concept do?"

A concept has become an idol when it claims the right to terminate mystery—when it ends the living question by offering a closed form that demands submission.

You can recognize this drift by several signs:

- The concept becomes non-negotiable, not because it is revealed by God, but because it stabilizes the person's identity.
- The concept becomes a weapon: dissent is treated as moral failure rather than honest difference.
- The concept becomes a shelter from repentance: it explains away conviction.
- The concept becomes a substitute for prayer: it is consulted the way God should be consulted.
- The concept becomes an alibi: it excuses unlove, pride, or harshness.

This test applies to secular and religious concepts alike. A scientific model can terminate mystery by declaring that anything not in its ontology is unreal. A theological system can terminate mystery by claiming to have God fully "figured out," leaving no room for fear of the Lord. Both are forms of conceptual sovereignty.

The apophatic argument insists that some mystery is not ignorance; it is the proper posture of creature before Creator. Mystery is not an excuse for laziness, but it is a boundary against idolatry. When a concept denies that boundary, it is no longer merely a concept. It has taken the seat of ultimacy.

Notice the difference between "mystery" and "confusion." The paper does not celebrate confusion. Confusion is often a failure of attention or discipline. Mystery, in this context, is the acknowledged excess of God over any creaturely representation. Mystery is not the absence of truth; it is the refusal to pretend that truth is possessed in full.

3.5 Prayer and worship as anti-model practices

If modeling is a temptation toward possession, then prayer and worship are, at their best, practices of non-possession. They enact a different epistemic posture: not mastery, but surrender; not control, but trust; not closure, but communion.

Prayer is not primarily an informational exchange. It is not "data collection about God." It is the act of turning toward the living God, admitting dependence, seeking mercy, aligning the will, receiving guidance, and consenting to be changed. In prayer, the self does not stand above God as analyst. The self stands before God as creature. That stance directly contradicts the model posture, where the mind stands above an object and renders it into a manageable form.

Worship is also anti-model because it refuses to treat God as an instrument. Worship says: God is not the means to my ends; God is the end. God is worthy. God is holy. God is Lord. Even when

worship uses words, those words function differently than model-claims. They are not primarily descriptive; they are doxological. They are acts of allegiance. They can contain truth, but their primary direction is not control but adoration and obedience.

There is also a practical effect: prayer and worship generate humility over time. They train the person to accept limits, to confess sin, to relinquish sovereignty. Models tend to train the opposite unless held under strong discipline: they train the person to expect legibility, control, and closure. Worship trains the person to accept that the deepest realities are not conquered by analysis.

This is why, for the apophatic argument, prayer and worship are not "add-ons." They are the central counter-practice. If the idol factory is the mind's desire to possess, then the antidote is a life that rehearses dependence and reverence. In that life, concepts can still be used, but they are kept in their place: servants, not lords; witnesses, not cages.

The section's conclusion is therefore sharp: God cannot be modeled not because God is irrational, but because modeling is a mode of possession and God is not given to possession. God is given to faith, obedience, love, and worship. Any attempt to replace that living relation with a conceptual substitute is not merely an epistemic error. It is idolatry in conceptual form.

4. The "All Models" Escalation: Creation Cannot Be Possessed Either

The apophatic argument is easiest to accept when its target is God. Most believers sense, even if they cannot articulate, that reducing God to a manageable object is blasphemy. But the central thesis of this paper goes further: the idol impulse does not stop at God. It extends into creation. The same desire that wants a conceptual handle on God also wants a conceptual handle on the world—and on other people. In practice, modernity rarely confesses "we have replaced God." It more often says, "we have explained everything." That is a substitution at the level of creation: the world is treated as fully legible, fully representable, fully capturable in a system. The result is not only epistemic error; it is a spiritual posture of possession.

This section escalates the critique: not only God, but creation, cannot be possessed by representation. The world can be studied, named, and partially modeled—humans are called to stewardship, not ignorance. Yet stewardship is not the same as sovereignty. When models are treated as total and final, the world is converted from encounter to inventory, from gift to mechanism, from mystery to managed object. What is lost is not only truth but reverence. And what replaces it is a thin, anxious confidence that must constantly defend its closure.

4.1 The world exceeds our frames: why total representation is impossible

Total representation is impossible for reasons that are not merely theological. They are structural.

First, a model must be smaller than what it models. Otherwise it ceases to be a model and becomes a duplicate. A perfect, total model of the world would need to contain the world's full detail, including the model itself and the agent consulting it. This creates a recursion: the model would need a model of itself containing a model of itself, and so on. The very concept of a total map is unstable.

Second, every representation involves selection. To represent is to choose what matters for the purpose at hand. But "what matters" is not an intrinsic property of the world; it is partly a moral and practical judgment. This means that the world cannot be captured without smuggling in values. Even the most "objective" model encodes a set of choices about what to count, what to ignore, what to treat as noise, what to treat as signal, what to treat as stable, what to treat as negligible. A total model would require total agreement about values, and that does not exist.

Third, the world is not only complex; it is also generative. New events happen. New configurations arise. New meanings emerge in the life of persons and communities. Even if the physical world were fully determined (a claim that itself is contested), the lived world of meaning, interpretation, relationship, and moral responsibility is not a static dataset. It is a living field. Total representation would require freezing life into an object. But life is not an object.

Fourth, as creatures, we stand inside what we would represent. Our knowing is situated: we have limited attention, limited lifespan, limited access, limited coherence. This is not a defect to be overcome by arrogance. It is the human condition. To forget it is to begin idol-making: to behave as if we were gods with a view from nowhere.

So the "all models" escalation is not: "don't ever model." It is: "do not pretend that modeling equals possession." The world exceeds our frames. This is not a concession to irrationality; it is a confession of creatureliness.

4.2 The temptation to replace witness with mastery

If total representation is impossible, why do we keep reaching for it? Because mastery offers psychological benefits that witness does not.

Witness is a mode of knowing that admits limits. It says: "Here is what I have seen; here is what I can testify; here is what I cannot claim." Witness can be strong without being total. It can be truthful without being exhaustive. It can be humble without being weak.

Mastery is different. Mastery aims at closure. It says: “I can explain the thing in a way that ends the question.” It transforms inquiry into ownership. It doesn’t merely observe; it claims the right to define.

The temptation is to replace witness with mastery because mastery reduces vulnerability. In witness, one remains open to surprise, correction, and mystery. In mastery, one can stop listening. Witness requires patience and moral restraint. Mastery offers speed and dominance.

In spiritual terms, witness is closer to gratitude: receiving creation as gift, speaking truthfully about what one has received, and remaining accountable to reality and to God. Mastery is closer to conquest: turning creation into an object for control, and then treating that control as proof of ultimacy. This is where modeling becomes idolatrous even when the object is not God. The model becomes the instrument of domination and the excuse for contempt: contempt for what is not yet explained, contempt for those who question the frame, contempt for the stubbornness of reality when it does not fit.

A culture trained in mastery tends to forget how to witness. It replaces testimony with theory, encounter with abstraction, and reverence with management. It can still speak of “wonder,” but wonder is reduced to a fleeting emotion rather than a permanent posture of humility.

4.3 Scientific models as exemplary idols: the prestige of quantified closure

Science is not uniquely idolatrous. But in modern life, scientific models are exemplary idols because they carry a particular kind of prestige: quantified closure. Numbers feel clean. Equations feel authoritative. Charts feel final. Quantification offers the strongest cultural signal of “this is real.” That cultural signal can be used responsibly. It can also be used to smuggle in metaphysical claims under the cover of technical competence.

Scientific models become exemplary idols in several ways.

First, their genuine successes encourage scope creep. Because physics can predict celestial mechanics with breathtaking accuracy, people assume physics can also pronounce on meaning, morality, and God. Because medicine can save lives, people assume medicine can define what a life is for. Because optimization can raise productivity, people assume optimization can define what a person is. This is not science; it is imperialism of method.

Second, quantified closure provides social leverage. If you can assign a number, you can govern. Institutions love numbers because numbers travel. They can be compared, ranked, traded, audited, and enforced. This makes scientific modeling attractive to power. Power does not primarily want truth; it wants control. When scientific models ally with power, the model’s authority can become coercive. The result is not merely wrong science; it is a moral deformation: people are forced to live inside a frame that may not honor their dignity.

Third, quantified closure suppresses the unquantifiable. Many of the most important realities in human life are partially measurable but not exhaustively so: trust, love, faith, courage, repentance, beauty, conscience. When the prestige of quantification becomes ultimacy, these realities are treated as secondary or illusory because they resist complete measurement. That is a spiritual loss: the world becomes thinner. The idol does not need to be false in its domain to be idolatrous in its cultural function. It becomes an idol when it declares itself the measure of all things.

In short, scientific models become idols when they are treated not as local maps of certain regularities, but as a total inventory of what exists and what matters. The prestige of quantified closure becomes a false sacrament: "if it can be modeled, it is real; if it cannot, it is not."

4.4 Political and moral models: the idol of the system that explains people

If scientific models tempt us toward ontological closure, political and moral models tempt us toward anthropological closure: the reduction of persons to instances of a system.

These models often start as partial insights. Patterns exist in social life. Incentives matter. Institutions shape behavior. History leaves scars. Group dynamics are real. But the idol is born when a framework becomes the final explanation of persons. When the model says: "You are nothing but your class, your race, your trauma, your evolutionary wiring, your ideology, your neurochemistry, your demographic cluster, your algorithmic risk score." The person disappears into the model.

This idol is especially dangerous because it feels moral. It can present itself as justice, liberation, progress, order, safety, or realism. And because it claims moral urgency, it can demand obedience with religious fervor. Once the system becomes sacred, dissent becomes heresy. Once the system explains everything, it can justify anything.

Political and moral models become idols through several familiar moves:

- Totalizing explanation: every human act is interpreted through one lens.
- Moral monopoly: the model claims the right to define good and evil.
- Dehumanizing legibility: people become types, not persons.
- Sacrificial coherence: the model requires scapegoats to stay coherent.

The last point matters. Systems that explain people often need someone to blame. A totalizing model protects itself by locating "the problem" in a group that can bear hatred. This is why idolatry is never only intellectual. It is ethical. Once a model becomes ultimate, it begins to generate victims.

A Christian critique here is straightforward: a human being is made in the image of God, not in the image of a system. A model can describe patterns in human behavior, but it cannot exhaust personhood. When it tries, it becomes an idol that competes with God's claim on the person.

4.5 The pastoral danger: despair and pride born from false totalities

False totalities do not only mislead the mind. They deform the heart. Their characteristic fruits are pride and despair—sometimes both at once.

Pride arises when a person believes they "have it." The total model makes them feel superior to those who don't share the frame. It gives them the intoxicating sense of standing above reality. Pride then expresses itself as contempt: contempt for tradition, contempt for faith, contempt for moral restraint, contempt for mystery, contempt for other human beings who refuse to be reduced.

Despair arises when the total model closes off hope. If reality is nothing but mechanism, then moral meaning is an illusion. If persons are nothing but outputs of systems, then repentance is naive. If the future is nothing but optimization or collapse, then prayer is pointless. Total models often claim to be "realistic," but their realism can become a form of spiritual violence: they declare hope irrational and then congratulate themselves for courage.

In pastoral terms, pride and despair are not abstract sins. They appear as:

- Cynicism that cannot be comforted.
- Anxiety that cannot be prayed through because the model forbids prayer.
- Shame that cannot be forgiven because the model knows only categories, not mercy.
- Rage that cannot be healed because the model requires enemies.
- A hardening of the soul that calls itself maturity.

This is why the critique of total models is not academic. It is care for souls. If a model has become ultimate, it will eventually demand worship and generate fruit consistent with idolatry: arrogance, harshness, dehumanization, hopelessness, and a narrowing of love.

The escalation therefore lands here: creation itself cannot be possessed. When a model claims totality, it lies about creation's depth and about human creatureliness. It also competes with God by offering a counterfeit providence: "the system explains all; the system saves; the system condemns." The pastoral task is to refuse that counterfeit, restore witness over mastery, and re-open the space where humility, prayer, moral responsibility, and hope can breathe.

5. The Self-Incrimination Problem and How Iconoclasm Survives It

Any severe critique of models runs into a sharp and legitimate objection: the critique itself is expressed in language, and language is representational. If "all models are idols," then the sentence "all models are idols" appears to be—at minimum—a model-like object: a general claim about reality, a conceptual frame, a compression of a vast field into a manageable proposition. This is the self-incrimination problem. It is not a cheap gotcha; it is a real boundary condition. If the critique cannot survive this problem, then it collapses into either incoherence ("I cannot say anything") or hypocrisy ("I condemn what I myself do while pretending I am exempt").

This section argues that the self-incrimination problem is survivable, but only if iconoclasm is understood not as a final theory but as a spiritual discipline. The move that saves iconoclasm is not to pretend the problem does not exist. The move is to accept the problem as part of the confession: we cannot speak without representation; therefore we must speak in a way that refuses to enthrone our speech. Iconoclasm survives by becoming self-policing, self-limiting, and penitential. It survives by refusing the very posture—conceptual sovereignty—that it critiques.

5.1 "All models are idols" as a model-claim

The statement "all models are idols" is obviously not a differential equation or a statistical fit. But it is still a representation. It makes a generalization. It draws a boundary. It compresses. It asks to be believed. In that sense, it behaves like a model.

If we treat the statement as a final metaphysical proposition that captures reality completely, then it becomes what it condemns: an idol. It would be a conceptual object claiming ultimacy, terminating discussion by fiat: "everything is idolatry; therefore nothing can be said." That posture would be not humility but domination disguised as humility.

So the iconoclast must grant the objection: yes, the claim self-incriminates if it is held as a possession. That concession is not a defeat. It is the point. The self-incrimination problem reveals the precise place where idolatry hides: not in the existence of concepts, but in the act of enthroning them. The statement is not dangerous because it is a statement. It is dangerous if it becomes a closed authority immune from correction, challenge, or repentance.

This is why the thesis "all models are idols" must be understood as a spiritual warning about a tendency, not as an omniscient mapping of reality. It is a judgment about the structural temptation of representation, not a claim that the speaker has achieved a representation-free perspective. In other words: the thesis condemns the very possibility of a "view from nowhere." Therefore it cannot honestly present itself as a view from nowhere.

The self-incrimination problem does not refute iconoclasm; it forces iconoclasm to be honest about its own limits.

5.2 Two ways through: absolute iconoclasm vs repentant instrument-use

Once the problem is admitted, there are two coherent ways forward. They are not equally easy, and they do not produce identical lives, but both can be internally consistent.

Absolute iconoclasm is the hard path. It treats representation as inherently dangerous and therefore minimizes it as far as possible. It does not deny that speech is representational; it accepts that as part of the fallen condition and responds with restraint. In practice, absolute iconoclasm looks like:

- Preference for silence over system.
- Preference for prayer over theory.
- Preference for testimony over explanation.
- Minimal doctrinal construction beyond what is necessary for confession and obedience.
- Continual refusal to build “world pictures” that claim completeness.

This path aims to starve the idol impulse by starving conceptual accumulation. Its strength is reverence. Its weakness is practical difficulty: teaching, coordination, and ordinary decision-making become harder, because humans rely on shared representations to act together.

Repentant instrument-use is the second path. It concedes that humans cannot live without models—language itself forces representation—yet insists that every model is spiritually dangerous and therefore must be handled under vow. The model is treated like fire: useful, but never embraceable. In practice, repentant instrument-use looks like:

- Use models for bounded tasks, but refuse metaphysical closure.
- Attach explicit humility clauses to every framework.
- Create practices of periodic renunciation (epistemic fasting).
- Submit models to fruit tests: if they produce pride, contempt, despair, or cruelty, they are treated as spiritually compromised.
- Build community accountability so that models cannot become private idols.

Both paths accept the self-incrimination problem. Absolute iconoclasm answers it by reducing speech and representation to the minimum necessary. Repentant instrument-use answers it by allowing speech while disciplining the posture of the speaker.

The difference between them is not whether models are dangerous; it is whether the danger is best managed by abstinence or by constrained use.

5.3 Confessional speech: speaking while denying possession

If iconoclasm is to survive without collapsing into silence, it needs a form of speech that does not pretend to own what it says. This is what we can call confessional speech.

Confessional speech differs from explanatory speech. Explanatory speech aims to close the question: it seeks coverage, completeness, and termination. Confessional speech aims to tell the truth in a posture of dependence: it speaks as creature, not as sovereign.

Confessional speech has several marks:

- It names its limits explicitly: “This is what I can say; beyond this I will not pretend.”
- It stays close to testimony: “This is what we have seen,” “this is what has been given,” “this is what has borne fruit.”
- It refuses totality: it does not claim to exhaust reality.
- It remains corrigible: it is willing to be corrected by Scripture, by conscience, by the community of faith, by the stubbornness of reality, and by God’s providential rebukes.
- It remains penitential: it knows that the heart can idolize even its own best words.

In Christian terms, confession is not primarily “opinion.” It is allegiance spoken under God. Yet it is not sovereignty. It is a way of speaking that rejects the temptation to dominate.

This matters because “all models are idols” can be held confessionally rather than imperially. Held confessionally, it becomes: “I am tempted to enthrone my representations; therefore I must practice renunciation.” Held imperially, it becomes: “I have discovered the final frame that condemns all frames.” The first is iconoclasm; the second is simply a new idol wearing iconoclast clothing.

Confessional speech therefore offers a way to speak without pretending that speech is ultimate. It does not solve the self-incrimination problem; it lives honestly inside it.

5.4 The logic of renunciation: using words without enthroning them

Renunciation is not merely an emotional attitude. It is a logic and a practice.

The logic is simple: because humans cannot avoid representation, the faithful task is not to eliminate words but to refuse to worship them. That refusal must be enacted repeatedly, because the idol impulse is repetitive. The heart re-crowns what it has previously renounced.

Renunciation has several practical forms:

- Provisionality: “I use this statement for this purpose, and I release it from ultimacy.”
- Non-attachment: “I will not defend this framework as if my identity depends on it.”
- Correctability: “I invite correction, and I will not treat correction as humiliation.”
- Reversal: “If this concept produces pride or cruelty, I will treat that as evidence it has become spiritually dangerous.”
- Release: “After a model has served its bounded purpose, I set it down.”

In other words, renunciation treats language and models as tools that must be put back into the toolbox. The idol impulse is precisely the refusal to put them down: the need to keep them visible, to keep them central, to keep them authoritative. Renunciation is the act of demoting the model.

This logic also explains how iconoclasm can speak at all. The iconoclast can say, “All models are idols,” not as a possession but as a warning—like saying, “Fire burns.” The statement is itself made of words; it is therefore not immune. But its purpose is not to enthrone itself; its purpose is to induce vigilance and restraint.

Renunciation also guards against the final trap: the idol of purity. The iconoclast may begin to worship their own refusal, treating their anti-model stance as proof of spiritual superiority. This too must be renounced. The point is not to stand above all frames. The point is to remain under God.

So the self-incrimination problem ends up doing something valuable. It forces iconoclasm to remain humble. It prevents the iconoclast from pretending to have escaped representation entirely. It reminds the reader that the only safe place is not “no models,” but God Himself. And because we still must speak, iconoclasm survives by speaking penitentially: using words while refusing to enthrone them, and letting even its own thesis remain under judgment.

6. Absolute Iconoclasm: The Hard, Pure Path

Absolute iconoclasm is the most consistent way to take the thesis “all models are idols.” If representation is structurally prone to become a substitute for living reality, and if the human heart is an idol factory, then the safest posture is to reduce representation as far as humanly possible. This is not merely a philosophical stance. It is an ethic, a discipline, and often a way of life. It seeks to starve the idol impulse by starving its preferred medium: conceptual possession.

The hard, pure path does not begin with contempt for thought. It begins with fear of the Lord. It treats the act of speaking as spiritually hazardous because speaking tends to harden into ownership. It treats the act of explaining as spiritually hazardous because explaining tends to become closure. It treats the act of system-building as spiritually hazardous because systems tend to enthrone themselves. Absolute iconoclasm therefore chooses restraint. It is not the absence of belief; it is the refusal to manufacture substitutes for God and reality.

This section describes absolute iconoclasm as an “ethic of silence” and “minimal speech,” then names its real costs and its real risks. The goal is not to romanticize the path. The goal is to show its integrity and its hazards so that readers who are drawn to it can walk it without self-deception.

6.1 The ethic of silence: restraint as reverence

Silence is not empty in absolute iconoclasm. Silence is reverent. It is a deliberate refusal to treat the deepest realities as objects for manipulation. It is the act of stepping back from the urge to fill space with explanations.

The ethic of silence rests on a few convictions:

- God is not mastered by our words.
- Reality is not stabilized by our frames.
- Speech can be a form of control, and control can be a form of unbelief.
- The craving to explain can be a craving to avoid dependence.

In this posture, restraint is not ignorance; it is obedience. The iconoclast hears the command against graven images not only as a command against statues but as a command against conceptual idols. If the heart is tempted to worship what it can hold, then the simplest protection is to hold less.

Silence also has a purifying function. It reveals the interior compulsions that speech often hides. When a person stops explaining, they feel the anxiety that explanation was medicating. They feel the insecurity that system-building was covering. They feel the desire to be right, to be seen as wise, to win. Silence forces those desires into the open where they can be repented of. In that sense, silence is not only reverence; it is diagnostics.

Absolute iconoclasm treats mystery not as a problem to be solved, but as a rightful boundary. Mystery says: you are a creature. The iconoclast chooses to live within that boundary rather than endlessly pushing against it.

There is a further theological intuition: some speech about God and creation is licit only when it emerges from worship rather than from the need to control. Silence makes room for that. When speech returns, it returns chastened.

6.2 Minimal speech: testimony, confession, and refusal of system-building

Absolute iconoclasm does not make speech impossible; it makes speech accountable. It favors minimal speech forms that resist conceptual possession: testimony and confession.

Testimony is close to witness. It says, “This is what I have seen,” “this is what I have received,” “this is what has borne fruit.” Testimony does not attempt total coverage. It does not claim to have closed the matter. It speaks as a limited person in a real world under God. It can be strong, and even uncompromising, without being totalizing.

Confession is similar but more inward. It says, “This is what I believe,” “this is what I have done,” “this is what I repent of,” “this is what I must obey.” Confession is not a map of the universe; it is a declaration of allegiance and accountability. It does not grant the speaker sovereignty. If anything, it places the speaker under judgment.

Absolute iconoclasm therefore refuses system-building. It resists the urge to connect every dot, to produce a complete metaphysical diagram, to turn spiritual life into a closed worldview. Not because dots do not connect, but because system-building is exactly where possession becomes likely. A system invites pride: “I have the whole picture.” It invites boundary policing: “outsiders are blind.” It invites harshness: “if the system is coherent, the victims are justified.” The iconoclast refuses that path.

This refusal does not necessarily imply doctrinal minimalism in the sense of denying core Christian confession. It implies doctrinal chastening: saying what must be said, refusing what need not be said, and declining to manufacture completeness where God has not given it. The aim is to preserve a living relationship with God rather than replacing that relationship with a conceptual structure that can be admired while God Himself is avoided.

Minimal speech also changes the moral tone. It tends to reduce triumphalism. It tends to increase attentiveness. It makes a person more willing to listen and less eager to win. Those are not guaranteed outcomes, but they are the intended fruits of the discipline.

6.3 The costs: coordination, teaching, and practical life

The hard path has costs, and the costs are not incidental. They are structural. Representation is one of the primary tools humans use for coordination. When you limit representation, you limit coordination. Absolute iconoclasm therefore must accept tradeoffs.

Coordination becomes harder because shared plans require shared models. Communities need to describe goals, roles, schedules, and responsibilities. Even a household needs representations: calendars, budgets, commitments, expectations. If the iconoclast refuses these too severely, practical life can become chaotic or dependent on others who will carry the modeling burden.

Teaching becomes harder because teaching requires simplification and structured explanation. A teacher must build a scaffold. A scaffold is a model. Absolute iconoclasm can therefore become a form of pedagogical austerity: "I will not explain too much because explanation seduces." That may preserve reverence, but it can also hinder growth. People need help to learn. They need language. They need clarity. If the iconoclast refuses this, they may produce a community of insiders who intuit the unsaid and outsiders who cannot enter.

Practical life becomes harder because decisions require some framework. "Should I take this job? Should we move? Should I trust this person? Should I seek medical treatment?" These decisions are not made by pure silence. They require weighing, discernment, pattern recognition, and sometimes formal tools. Absolute iconoclasm can be tempted to spiritualize indecision: to treat refusal to model as holiness rather than as avoidance.

There is also a social cost: absolute iconoclasm often produces small communities. Large institutions require shared frameworks and formalization. If the iconoclast cannot tolerate that, they may remain on the margins. That can be faithful. It can also be isolating, which introduces new vulnerabilities: echo chambers, uncorrected errors, dependency on charismatic leaders, or simply exhaustion.

These costs do not refute the hard path. They define it. Absolute iconoclasm is not a strategy for efficiency; it is a strategy for spiritual safety. But it must be honest about what it sacrifices.

6.4 The risks: performative purity, hidden pride, and sectarian brittleness

The hard path also carries risks, and these risks are spiritual, not merely practical. In fact, they are the most ironic risks: iconoclasm can become its own idol.

Performative purity is the risk of treating restraint as a badge. The iconoclast may begin to measure holiness by how little they say, how few concepts they allow, how aggressively they refuse frameworks. Silence becomes a performance. Refusal becomes identity. The person becomes attached not to God but to their own purity posture. This is just the idol of the self in minimalist clothing.

Hidden pride is the risk that iconoclasm produces superiority. The iconoclast may look at ordinary believers who use models—doctrinal systems, apologetics frameworks, scientific accounts—and treat them as spiritually inferior. The iconoclast may say, "I refuse idols," while

secretly taking pride in being the only one who sees. That pride is precisely the conceptual sovereignty iconoclasm was meant to renounce.

Sectarian brittleness is the risk that minimal speech becomes minimal mercy. When a community refuses articulation, it can become difficult to repair misunderstandings. Disputes become unaddressable because addressing them requires explanation. The community may develop unspoken rules that cannot be questioned because to question them requires modeling. This produces brittleness: conflict is managed by exclusion rather than clarification. The result can be a small, rigid group with high purity and low compassion.

There is also a risk of anti-intellectual reaction masquerading as holiness. A person might refuse models not out of reverence but out of fear of complexity, resentment of expertise, or laziness. Absolute iconoclasm must therefore be paired with moral honesty: am I refusing because I fear idolatry, or because I fear being corrected? Am I silent because I am reverent, or because I am unwilling to do the work of love?

Finally, there is the risk of losing the capacity to name lies. In a world where false totalities harm people, silence can become complicity. If a system dehumanizes and the iconoclast refuses to engage because engagement requires models, then the iconoclast may fail the neighbor. Love sometimes requires speech. Love sometimes requires clarity. Absolute iconoclasm must decide how it will obey that demand without surrendering to system-building.

So the hard, pure path is not a simple spiritual upgrade. It is a demanding vocation. It can preserve reverence by refusing conceptual possession, and it can also generate new idols of purity and superiority. Its success depends not on the austerity of its speech but on the humility of its heart. The path is only holy if it remains under God—if it treats silence as worship and not as self-justification, and if it refuses to turn even iconoclasm into a throne.

7. Repentant Instrument-Use: Models as Emergency Tools Under Vow

Absolute iconoclasm is coherent, but it is also costly and rare. Most people cannot live inside it without either collapsing practical life or quietly outsourcing modeling to others. Repentant instrument-use is the alternative: it accepts the thesis that models are structurally idol-prone, and it accepts the self-incrimination problem, but it refuses to pretend that human life can proceed without representation. Instead of abolishing models, it disciplines them. It handles them the way one handles fire: with need, caution, boundaries, and readiness to set them down.

The word repentant matters. It signals that the posture is not “models are fine if used correctly,” but “models are dangerous even when used well, because my heart is prone to enthrone them.”

The model is not approached as a neutral gadget but as a spiritual hazard. The discipline is therefore covenantal: models are allowed only under vow, only within scope, only with humility clauses, and only under fruit-based discernment.

This section provides the positive framework that makes the paper livable. If the earlier sections diagnose the idol impulse, this section provides a workable, morally serious alternative to both totalizing system-worship and paralyzing silence.

7.1 Why humans cannot live without representations

Humans cannot live without representations because human finitude forces compression. We do not see everything at once. We cannot attend to unlimited detail. We cannot hold the world in working memory. We therefore summarize. We categorize. We name. We plan. These are representations.

Language itself is representation. Every noun compresses a vast range of particulars into a shared sign. Every sentence selects and excludes. Even prayer uses words, and words are models of a kind. Unless one chooses radical silence, representation is unavoidable. The question is not whether we will model. The question is whether we will worship what we model.

Practical life intensifies this necessity. A family needs schedules, budgets, responsibilities, and shared expectations. A community needs procedures and shared meanings. A society needs laws and institutions. A physician must use diagnostic categories. An engineer must use equations. A traveler must use a map. These are not luxuries. They are the scaffolding of action in a complex world.

Even moral life uses representation. When we say “keep your promises,” we are applying a model of fidelity that compresses many situations into a guiding principle. When we say “love your neighbor,” we are using a concept of neighbor that reaches beyond immediate sensation. Moral action is not possible without some generalization.

Therefore, repentant instrument-use begins with a confession of necessity: we model because we are creatures. But the same confession contains a warning: because we are creatures, we must not treat our models as gods.

7.2 The fire doctrine: models are useful, but never embraceable

Fire is one of the best analogies for this posture because it is both indispensable and dangerous. Fire cooks food, warms homes, and enables civilization. Fire also burns flesh, consumes forests, and destroys lives. The responsible response is neither to worship fire nor to pretend it is harmless. The responsible response is containment: hearth, stove, furnace, controlled flame.

The fire doctrine says: models are permitted because they are necessary, but they must be contained because they are spiritually hazardous. A model's benefits—clarity, prediction, coordination—are real. Its hazards—closure, pride, dehumanization, metaphysical overreach—are also real. The discipline is to enjoy the benefits without absorbing the hazards, which requires boundaries.

The fire doctrine has several practical implications:

- Use models for defined tasks, then set them down.
- Do not carry the model everywhere as if it were a universal key.
- Do not warm your identity by the model's flame.
- Do not demand that all reality conform to the model's shape.
- Keep a "firebreak" between technical success and ultimate meaning.

In this posture, models are not despised; they are distrusted. Not distrusted because they are always wrong, but because the heart tends to treat the glow of success as proof of ultimacy. Fire doctrine trains the opposite: success does not enthrone; success only licenses use within bounds.

7.3 The vow set: no-ultimacy, no-oracle, no-worship, revision, humility

Repentant instrument-use becomes concrete through vows. These are not legalistic rules meant to produce superiority. They are guardrails meant to prevent idolatry. A vow is a pre-commitment made when the mind is clear, so that the heart cannot enthrone the tool when it is tempted by fear or pride.

A workable vow set includes at least five vows.

No-ultimacy vow: The model may not claim the final seat. It may not define what exists in total. It may not declare that what it cannot represent is unreal. The model is not allowed to become metaphysics. It remains technique.

No-oracle vow: The model may not speak as judge over persons and souls. It may inform prudence; it may not replace conscience. It may guide a decision; it may not command worship. It may not pronounce spiritual verdicts ("there is no God," "hope is irrational," "love is only chemistry," "repentance is childish"). Those are not model outputs; they are idol moves.

No-worship vow: The model may not become identity, status, or salvation. It may not become the thing one trusts for existential reassurance. If one feels safe because the model "explains it," that safety must be examined. The heart must remain anchored in God, not in explanatory closure.

Revision vow: The model must remain revisable. If the model becomes non-negotiable, it is already drifting toward idol status. Revision is not only an epistemic virtue; it is a spiritual humility. The revisable model stays in the tool category rather than climbing into the throne category.

Humility vow: The user of the model commits to lowliness: to be corrected without humiliation, to admit uncertainty without shame, to resist contempt, to refuse triumphalism. Humility is not a mood; it is a disciplined posture that prevents the model from becoming a weapon.

Together these vows convert “model use” into “model use under God.” They force the user to keep ultimate trust where it belongs and to treat technique as technique.

7.4 The humility clause: every model must carry an explicit confession of limits

A vow set can remain private. The humility clause makes restraint public. It requires that every model, when presented or invoked, carry an explicit confession of its limits. This is not academic hedging. It is a moral act: refusing to let the model masquerade as ultimacy.

A humility clause answers questions like:

- What domain does this model address?
- What does it explicitly leave out?
- What assumptions does it require?
- What would falsify or revise it?
- What is it not licensed to claim?

This clause is especially important when models have institutional power. A model used in medicine, policy, education, or security can reshape lives. Without humility clauses, models silently become moral authorities. With humility clauses, their authority is bounded and contestable.

The humility clause also has a spiritual function: it interrupts the liturgy of closure. It forces the speaker to confess creatureliness at the moment they are tempted to appear sovereign. It reminds the audience that the model is a map, not the territory; a tool, not a judge; a compression, not a capture.

In writing, the humility clause can be literal. A paper can include a “Limitations and Non-Claims” section that is not a perfunctory ritual but a theological discipline: a refusal to cross domains. In conversation, the humility clause can be habitual: “This helps here; it doesn’t speak to ultimacy.” Over time, this becomes a cultural immune system against scientism and ideological totalization.

7.5 The fruit test: how to tell when a model has become an idol

Because idolatry is functional, we need functional diagnostics. The fruit test is the central diagnostic in repentant instrument-use. It does not ask first, “Is the model correct?” It asks, “What does the model produce in the people who live inside it?” A model may be locally predictive and still spiritually corrupting. The fruit test reveals that corruption.

Signs that a model has become an idol include:

Explanatory addiction: You feel anxious without the model. You cannot tolerate open questions. You rush to closure. You seek reassurance, not truth. The model has become emotional medication.

Contempt production: The model generates disdain for people who do not share it. It teaches you to treat others as stupid, evil, or unworthy. Contempt is a hallmark of idol enthronement because idols demand boundary policing.

Dehumanization: The model reduces persons to variables. It treats people as instances of categories. It makes mercy feel irrational. When the model’s coherence requires victims, the idol is active.

Moral numbing: The model supplies excuses. It explains away conscience. It makes repentance seem unnecessary. It produces a “nothing is my fault, it’s the system” posture. That is spiritual corrosion.

Metaphysical leakage: The model starts making claims outside its domain: about God, meaning, hope, or moral obligation. The moment a technical tool begins issuing worldview verdicts, it is functioning as an idol.

Inflexibility and panic: The model becomes untouchable. Evidence or experience that contradicts it produces rage or denial. This is the psychological signature of worship: the sacred object must be defended at all costs.

Identity fusion: The model becomes your identity. Critiquing it feels like attacking you. This fusion is a powerful signal that the model has climbed into the self’s throne room.

The fruit test also has positive indicators. When models are used repentantly, they tend to produce:

- calm openness rather than frantic closure,
- curiosity rather than contempt,
- compassion rather than dehumanization,

- accountability rather than excuse-making,
- humility rather than triumphalism.

No diagnostic is perfect. But fruits matter because idolatry is not only a set of wrong ideas; it is a misdirected trust that reshapes character. A model becomes an idol when it claims what belongs to God: ultimacy, salvation, moral authority, and the right to terminate mystery.

Repentant instrument-use therefore offers a livable middle posture: not silence as the only holiness, and not modeling as the new worship, but disciplined use under vow. It acknowledges the danger of representation without pretending that human life can proceed without maps. It treats models as emergency tools, not as altars. It requires continual renunciation, continual humility clauses, and continual fruit testing—because the idol impulse is not defeated once; it is resisted daily.

8. Case Study: Cosmology and the Worship of Explanations

Cosmology is a uniquely revealing case study for this paper because it sits exactly where the temptation to idolatry is strongest: at the edge of human scale, confronting origins, totality, destiny, and the meaning of "everything." The very word cosmos invites a total picture. People do not merely want a useful model; they want the last story. And because cosmology uses mathematics, precision instruments, and spectacular imagery, it carries immense cultural prestige. It can feel like an authorized priesthood for ultimacy. In that setting, "explanation" easily becomes worship.

The goal of this section is not to argue cosmology's technical merits or faults. The goal is spiritual and epistemic: to show how even a cautious, sophisticated scientific enterprise can become an idol in public meaning and private psyche, and to propose a disciplined way to speak about cosmological claims without letting them become metaphysical sovereigns.

We will focus on two emblematic objects: "dark matter" and "CMB inference." Both begin as technical terms within bounded modeling practice. Both can be—and often are—recruited into a godless worldview as if the technical fit itself were a metaphysical verdict. That recruitment is the category error. The antidote is not ignorance; it is disciplined refusal.

8.1 Dark matter and "bookkeeping" as a seduction toward ontological closure

Within mainstream practice, "dark matter" can be introduced in a modest way: we infer, across multiple datasets, that the gravitational account does not close if we only count luminous matter. A placeholder is introduced: some additional gravitating component, non-luminous

under ordinary detection, that behaves in certain constrained ways. In this modest introduction, "dark matter" is not a god and not even a full claim about ontology. It is a handle on mismatch.

But the seduction begins immediately, because humans hate placeholders. A placeholder is an open wound: it admits ignorance. It threatens the desire for completion. And completion is exactly what cosmology is culturally expected to deliver.

So the placeholder is quickly reified. The language shifts from "bookkeeping term" to "stuff." It becomes "a thing out there" rather than "a name for a gap under assumptions." This is not necessarily irrational—often the world does contain things we first inferred. The spiritual danger is not inference; it is closure. Once "dark matter" becomes "stuff," it becomes psychologically satisfying. The account feels complete again. The anxiety of mismatch is soothed.

Then a further shift occurs: ontological closure. The placeholder is used as proof that reality is exhaustively material and mechanistic. The argument is not stated explicitly, but it is enacted:

- We see a mismatch.
- We name the mismatch.
- The name becomes a thing.
- The thing becomes part of "the inventory of what exists."
- The inventory becomes a worldview: "all that exists is what the model inventories."

At this point "dark matter" is not merely a technical hypothesis. It is functioning as a sacramental token of materialism: "even what you can't see is still just more stuff." The placeholder becomes a badge of metaphysical completion.

This is the seduction: bookkeeping becomes ontology. A term meant to mark the boundary of the known becomes a claim that there is no boundary worth respecting. The "dark" in dark matter should have kept humility alive—unknown coupling, unknown detection. Instead it often becomes an advertising word for omniscience: "we have explained the unseen too."

In the paper's framework, dark matter here is an emblem of how models invite possession. A model leaves a gap; the heart cannot tolerate the gap; the gap is filled with a reified entity; the entity becomes a worldview token; the worldview token becomes an idol of closure.

8.2 CMB inference as a prestige engine: when spectra become sermons

The cosmic microwave background (CMB) is, for most people, not an everyday object of experience. It is mediated through instruments, pipelines, statistical models, and visualizations. This mediation increases the prestige of the result: it looks like the voice of "the universe itself," delivered through technical priesthood.

Prestige becomes a spiritual risk when it is confused with ultimacy. A power spectrum can be treated not as a careful inference under assumptions but as a cosmic sermon: “Here is what the universe is; here is what you must believe.”

Several factors make CMB inference a strong prestige engine:

- The sheer scale: it feels like access to origins and totality.
- The mathematical aesthetics: the peaks look orderly, almost “authoritative.”
- The institutional weight: major collaborations, satellites, and public agencies.
- The cultural hunger: people want a story that replaces theology.

Under these conditions, the CMB result can be socially received as a metaphysical disclosure. The plot becomes a catechism. The parameters become a creed. “We know the universe’s composition” becomes a statement with theological flavor: a replacement for confession.

The risk is not that the inference is always wrong. The risk is that the inference is given a job it does not have. A constrained statistical fit is treated as a final revelation about being. The language shifts from “this set of assumptions yields a strong match” to “this is what reality is.” And once that shift occurs, moral and spiritual conclusions begin to ride on a technical artifact.

This is what it means for spectra to become sermons. Not that scientists intend to preach. But that the public and the broader culture treat the outputs of cosmological inference as existential scripture: a text that tells us what we are and what we can hope for. And because the text is mathematical, it feels unchallengeable.

In this way, the CMB becomes less a measurement and more a liturgical object of modernity’s hidden religion: a ritual of looking at the heavens and concluding that the heavens are godless.

8.3 The category error: from constrained fit to godless worldview

Here is the key error the paper targets: the slide from within-model success to metaphysical closure.

A constrained fit is a technical event. It says: given assumptions A, and data D, parameter set P yields good agreement and predicts additional observables within error tolerances. That is a bounded claim. It is not trivial; it can be powerful. But it remains bounded.

A godless worldview is a total claim. It says: ultimate reality is only matter, only law, only mechanism; God is not real or not relevant; moral meaning is a projection; hope is sentimentality. That is not a consequence of a parameter fit. It is an additional philosophical commitment.

The category error occurs when these are fused:

- “Because the model fits, therefore the model is reality.”
- “Because the model is predictive, therefore it is ultimate.”
- “Because the model is sufficient for this domain, therefore God is unnecessary in every domain.”
- “Because we can describe mechanisms, therefore there is no Creator.”
- “Because we have an account of patterns, therefore there is no purpose.”

Each “therefore” is illicit. It is not derivable from the technical success. It is a metaphysical smuggling operation. It imports an ideology of closure into what is, at best, an instrument of pattern description.

In the language of this paper: the model becomes an idol when it claims ultimacy, oracle authority, or salvation. In cosmology, the idol claim often looks like: “This is the whole story. There is nothing beyond this.” The CMB does not say that. Dark matter does not say that. Those are the voices of a rival religion hitchhiking on science.

The deepest irony is that the category error often masquerades as humility: “we only trust what we can measure.” But that is not humility; it is an ultimacy claim about what counts as real. It is not modesty; it is a metaphysical border patrol. It denies whole classes of reality—persons, moral obligation, God—by definitional exclusion. That is not scientific; it is idolatrous closure.

8.4 A disciplined refusal: what can be said without enthroning the model

The antidote is not to pretend cosmology cannot know anything. The antidote is to speak with disciplined refusal: to say what can be said, and to refuse what cannot be claimed without idolatry.

Under repentant instrument-use, we can articulate a “cosmology humility clause” that travels with every statement:

- We distinguish measurement from mechanism.
- We distinguish mechanism from metaphysical meaning.
- We confess the boundedness of the model.
- We refuse to turn a technical fit into a worldview verdict.

So what can be said?

About dark matter, one can say: “Across several lines of observation, there is a gravitational mismatch under common assumptions; ‘dark matter’ is a placeholder name for how the model closes that mismatch.” One can also say: “This placeholder may correspond to a real physical component, or it may reflect a limitation in our gravitational modeling, or both.” That is honest. It keeps the gap open without letting the gap become despair.

About the CMB, one can say: “We infer patterns in the sky’s microwave background; within a framework, these patterns constrain parameter combinations that describe an early-universe history.” One can also say: “This is an inference under assumptions; it has cross-checks and strengths, and it also has dependence on pipelines and interpretive frames.” That is honest. It treats the inference as witness, not revelation.

And what must be refused?

- “Therefore reality is godless.”
- “Therefore purpose is illusion.”
- “Therefore prayer is irrational.”
- “Therefore morality is mere adaptation.”
- “Therefore what cannot be modeled is not real.”

Those refusals are not anti-scientific. They are pro-truth. They are category protection. They prevent the model from doing a job it cannot do without becoming an idol.

A believer can therefore engage cosmology without surrendering to scientism:

- Affirm the measurement as part of creation’s regularity.
- Use the mechanism models as provisional tools.
- Treat placeholders as humility markers, not as metaphysical trophies.
- Keep ultimacy where it belongs: in God, not in parameters.

This discipline does not require adding “God” as a term in the equations. It requires refusing to turn the equations into gods. It returns cosmology to its rightful status: an exploration of created order, valuable and limited. And it returns the heart to its rightful posture: awe without capture, learning without worship, explanation without replacement.

9. Case Study: Moral and Political Models as Idols

If cosmology tempts us with ontological closure—"this is the inventory of reality"—moral and political models tempt us with anthropological closure—"this is what people are." And because politics and morality touch fear, safety, guilt, status, and belonging, their models are often more emotionally addictive than scientific ones. They do not merely explain; they justify. They do not merely predict; they condemn and absolve. They provide a map of enemies and friends, purity and contamination, innocence and guilt. In that sense, moral and political models are among the most dangerous idols because they can wear the mask of righteousness.

The argument here is not that frameworks are always false. Frameworks can carry partial truth. History leaves real scars. Incentives do shape behavior. Groups do form patterns. Power does corrupt. Social dynamics do exist. The idol move is not noticing patterns. The idol move is enthroning the pattern as final, so that a person becomes less real than the system that explains them.

In Christian terms, the risk is plain: to replace a person made in the image of God with a category is to commit a kind of conceptual violence. It is to deny the irreducibility of personhood, the call to mercy, and the possibility of repentance and transformation. An idolized model does not merely misdescribe; it devours. It consumes moral attention and redirects worship away from God and neighbor toward the system itself.

9.1 When a framework replaces a person

A framework replaces a person when it becomes the primary way you see them—when their face disappears behind your explanation. This can happen on every side of politics and morality. The mechanism is stable:

- The framework promises moral clarity.
- Moral clarity reduces anxiety.
- Reduced anxiety feels like virtue.
- The framework becomes identity.
- The person becomes a case.

At that point, you are no longer relating to a neighbor. You are relating to a category.

This replacement often begins with a true insight: "Some behaviors are patterned." But the idol begins when the framework claims exhaustive power. It says: "I can tell you what this person is, why they act, what they secretly want, and why they cannot be trusted." It becomes a mind-reading machine.

When a framework replaces a person, several deformations follow:

- Listening dies. Why listen if you already know what they are?
- Curiosity dies. Why wonder if the system explains it?
- Mercy dies. Why show mercy if the category is guilty by definition?
- Accountability becomes selective. Your side is complex; their side is simple.
- Repentance becomes impossible. Either you are pure or you are irredeemable.

This replacement also harms the one who uses the framework. It trains them to live at a distance from reality. Persons are messy. They interrupt theories. They carry contradiction. They demand patience. A framework that replaces persons saves the user from the labor of love. It turns neighbor-love into management.

The idol, spiritually, is the frame itself: it is what you trust to deliver righteousness. Instead of seeking God's judgment (which is both truthful and merciful), the user seeks the framework's judgment (which is often harsh and simplifying). The system becomes the moral oracle.

9.2 Predictive governance and the idol of legibility

Predictive governance is the modern intensification of this tendency. It is the attempt to govern humans by making them legible: to convert persons into risk scores, propensity estimates, demographic clusters, behavioral profiles, and optimization targets.

Legibility has legitimate uses. Some patterns are real and can protect people. But the idol of legibility appears when the state or institution treats legibility as righteousness—when making people readable becomes the same as making society just.

The idol of legibility has a particular theology, even when it denies theology:

- The highest good is manageability.
- The highest virtue is predictability.
- The highest peace is control.
- The highest justice is optimization.

This "theology" is implemented through metrics and models. The institution believes it can reduce harm by modeling behavior. But because models are compressions, they inevitably flatten. They transform the person into "the kind of person who…" That flattening is not a mere technical issue. It is a moral transgression when it becomes authoritative over the person's standing.

Predictive governance becomes idolatrous when:

- A score becomes more real than a story.
- A prediction becomes more real than a promise.
- A category becomes more real than a conscience.
- A model becomes more real than mercy.

The danger compounds because such systems tend to hide their moral assumptions. They present themselves as neutral. But neutrality is a myth: every model encodes values about what counts as harm, what counts as risk, what outcomes are acceptable, whose errors matter, and whose suffering is tolerable. The idol of legibility is especially deceptive because it can claim innocence: "the model decided."

In Christian terms, this is a displacement of responsibility. "The model decided" is a modern version of "the idol demanded." It relocates agency from the moral agent to the system. And once agency is displaced, repentance becomes harder. Systems do not repent. People do.

9.3 Scapegoat models: systems that require victims to stay coherent

Some models do not only flatten; they sacrifice. A scapegoat model is a framework that preserves its coherence by assigning blame to a designated group. It needs victims the way a fragile machine needs a load-bearing strut. Without the scapegoat, contradictions would appear. With the scapegoat, the story stays clean.

The structure is recognizable:

- Identify a complex social problem.
- Reduce it to one cause that is morally vivid.
- Locate that cause in a group that can be hated safely.
- Treat exceptions as propaganda.
- Treat compassion as betrayal.

Scapegoat models can be dressed up as realism or as justice. They can be right-wing or left-wing. They can be religious or secular. What defines them is not the content of their enemy list but the moral mechanism: coherence purchased through victimhood.

These models become idols because they generate a clear moral world. The believer in the model gains:

- innocence (I am on the right side),

- certainty (the cause is simple),
- unity (we agree on the enemy),
- energy (anger fuels action),
- and a feeling of righteousness.

This is why scapegoat models are spiritually addictive. They offer what idolatry often offers: a counterfeit righteousness that bypasses repentance. The enemy bears the burden. The community is purified by hatred.

Christianity has an explicit critique of this mechanism. The gospel overturns scapegoating by exposing the innocence of the victim par excellence (Christ) and by calling the community to repentance rather than projection. In that light, scapegoat models are not only intellectually suspicious; they are morally and spiritually poisonous. They train people to love their story more than their neighbor.

And they tend to produce predictable fruits: cruelty justified as necessity, mercy dismissed as weakness, and truth subordinated to the need to keep the narrative coherent.

9.4 Repair discipline: restoring persons above explanations

If models are idol-prone, and if politics amplifies idolatry, what can be done? The paper's answer is not "never use frameworks." It is "repair discipline": a set of practices that restore the person's primacy over the explanation.

Repair discipline begins with a ranking: persons above models. Not because models are useless, but because persons are sacred. The model serves; the person rules. This ranking is a moral commitment, not a technical one.

Several concrete practices follow.

Face-first practice: Before you apply a framework, you seek the person. You ask: what is their story? What is their suffering? What is their agency? What is their responsibility? You treat them as irreducible. This does not mean you ignore patterns; it means you refuse to let patterns erase a face.

Non-totality rule: You refuse single-lens explanations. You treat any one framework as partial. If a model explains too much too cleanly, you become suspicious. Totalizing clarity is often a sign of scapegoating or flattening.

Mercy-preservation rule: If a framework makes mercy feel irrational, you treat that as a spiritual alarm. Any system that cannot make room for mercy will eventually demand victims.

Accountability relocation: You refuse to outsource moral agency to systems. You do not say "the model decided" as a moral shield. You require human responsibility: someone must own the decision, explain it, and be open to repentance and correction.

Reversibility test: You ask whether you would accept the model's treatment if it were applied to you or your loved ones. This test exposes hidden cruelty and hidden arrogance. If you would not accept being reduced to a risk score, you should not accept reducing others.

Repair over victory: You prioritize restoration over narrative dominance. The goal is not to win the story war; the goal is to restore truth and dignity. This is costly, because it requires humility and patience rather than the adrenaline of certainty.

These practices do not eliminate disagreement. But they change the moral texture of disagreement. They keep political life from becoming a theater of idol worship where the system's coherence matters more than the neighbor's dignity.

In this case study, the paper's larger thesis becomes painfully concrete: a model becomes an idol when it replaces God's prerogatives—judgment, mercy, ultimacy—and when it replaces the neighbor with an explanatory category. Repair discipline is the refusal of that replacement. It is the insistence that explanations serve persons, not consume them. It is the return of moral life to a posture where truth is pursued without sacrificing love—and where no system is allowed to demand worship through victimhood.

10. Practices of Anti-Idolatrous Knowing

If models are structurally idol-prone, then the solution cannot be purely intellectual. You do not defeat idolatry by winning an argument. Idolatry is a posture of trust, a way the heart seeks safety, and a set of habits that form what feels ultimate. Therefore anti-idolatrous knowing must be practiced. It must be embodied. It must be repeated. It must become a counter-formation against the hidden liturgies of modernity.

This section proposes five practices. They are not "tips." They are disciplines—repeatable habits that train a different epistemic posture: humility instead of sovereignty, witness instead of mastery, communion instead of control. They aim to keep models in their rightful place as tools under God rather than as altars. Each practice is a way of refusing conceptual possession while still living and acting in the world.

10.1 Liturgies of humility: prayer, confession, thanksgiving, repentance

Humility is not primarily an emotion. It is a trained posture. The modern temptation is to treat humility as a personality trait—some people have it, others don't. But humility, in the spiritual

sense relevant here, is cultivated through liturgy: repeated acts that place the self under God and re-order trust.

Prayer is the foundational liturgy because it reverses the model posture. In modeling, I stand over an object and render it tractable. In prayer, I stand before God and admit dependence. Prayer says: I am not self-sufficient. I do not own reality. I do not control outcomes. I am addressed, judged, guided, and sustained by Another. This posture directly resists the will-to-closure.

Confession intensifies that resistance. Confession is not analysis. Confession is surrender: "I have sinned." It breaks the spell of self-justification, which is one of the reasons models become idols. Idols protect the ego; confession dismantles it. An explanatory system can be used to excuse, rationalize, or blame-shift; confession refuses excuse-making. It keeps the knower morally accountable. It says: truth is not something I use to dominate others; truth is something that judges me first.

Thanksgiving is another anti-idolatrous practice because it frames reality as gift rather than inventory. A model invites ownership: "I have it." Thanksgiving invites reception: "I have received." Gift-language is a direct antidote to conceptual possession. When you thank God, you are reminded that you are a receiver, not a sovereign. You inhabit creation as grace, not as raw material for mastery.

Repentance is the ongoing corrective. Idolatry is not a one-time mistake; it is a recurring drift. Repentance is the willingness to turn back repeatedly: to demote what you have enthroned, to renounce what you have clung to, to release what you have made ultimate. Repentance keeps the mind flexible and the heart soft. It prevents the model from becoming an identity fortress.

Taken together, these liturgies form an epistemic posture: knowing as a creature under God. They do not abolish intellectual work; they purify it by refusing to let intellect become lord.

10.2 Epistemic fasting: periodic abstention from explanatory closure

Fasting is a way of revealing dependence by withholding what comforts. Epistemic fasting applies the same logic to explanation. It is the deliberate, periodic abstention from closure—refusing, for a time, the quick move to "here's the frame," "here's the theory," "here's the explanation," "here's the conclusion."

The purpose is not to glorify uncertainty. The purpose is to break explanatory addiction. Many people do not crave truth; they crave relief. Explanation provides relief. Epistemic fasting exposes that craving. It asks: can I tolerate open questions without panic? Can I remain peaceful without a complete story? Can I live faithfully without possessing an account of everything?

Practically, epistemic fasting can take several forms:

- Delayed interpretation: when confronted with a complex event, you wait before forming a total narrative. You gather testimony. You allow ambiguity. You resist the compulsion to declare final meaning.
- No-omniscience rule: you refrain from making global claims ("this explains everything," "this is what it all means") for a set period, forcing yourself to speak locally and modestly.
- Silence intervals: you set aside time where you do not consume explanatory content—no commentary, no endless analysis—and instead pray, read Scripture, or sit with reality.
- Model abstinence: you intentionally avoid using your favorite framework for a week (political, psychological, theological, scientific) and see what you notice when you cannot use it as a filter.

Epistemic fasting helps distinguish two different kinds of peace. There is the peace that comes from closure (often counterfeit), and there is the peace that comes from trust (often deeper). The fast reveals which peace you have been relying on.

10.3 Community constraints: accountability against private certainty

Idolatry thrives in private certainty. A person alone with their model can become intoxicated by coherence. They can confirm themselves endlessly, interpret everything through their frame, and gradually stop hearing correction. The model becomes an oracle, and the self becomes its prophet.

Community constraints are therefore essential. They are not censorship; they are humility structures. They force the knower to submit their interpretations to others who can see blind spots, challenge assumptions, and test fruits.

Effective community constraints include:

- Confessional accountability: trusted people who can ask hard questions about your posture, not just your arguments. "Are you becoming harsh?" "Are you becoming contemptuous?" "Is this making you despair?"
- Diverse perspective exposure: people who do not share your default frameworks, who can name what your model erases.
- Correction norms: a shared rule that correction is not humiliation but love. Without this norm, people hide errors; with it, they can repent and revise without shame.

- Authority limits: no person in the community becomes the final interpreter. Communities that idolize a leader simply relocate idolatry from model to personality.
- Fruit-centered evaluation: the community evaluates not only what you claim, but what your claiming produces.

These constraints protect against the most subtle idol: the self as ultimate. If your model makes you uncorrectable, the model has already become a god. Community keeps the soul permeable.

10.4 The discipline of testimony: witness over system

Testimony is the disciplined practice of speaking truthfully without claiming totality. It is the alternative to system-speech. It favors what is given, what is seen, what is lived, what is accountable, over what is total and closed.

In testimony, you say:

- “Here is what happened.”
- “Here is what I saw.”
- “Here is what I did.”
- “Here is what I cannot claim.”
- “Here is what I believe, under God.”

Testimony refuses to speak like an oracle. It resists the temptation to convert every event into proof of a grand system. It keeps language close to reality, where correction is possible. It also keeps the moral agent visible. Systems often erase the speaker: the system “speaks itself” through them. Testimony restores agency: I am responsible for my words. I am accountable for my claims.

In political and moral life, testimony is especially important because it breaks scapegoat mechanisms. Scapegoat models thrive on abstraction and totalizing stories. Testimony forces concreteness. It makes it harder to hate imaginary categories when real faces and real stories are present.

In theological life, testimony aligns with the biblical pattern: “what we have seen and heard we proclaim.” This does not abolish doctrine; it places doctrine under witness rather than above it. Doctrine becomes confession rather than possession.

10.5 The discipline of wonder: awe without capture

Wonder is not merely an emotion; it is a stance toward reality. Wonder says: reality exceeds me. Wonder is therefore anti-idolatrous by nature—unless it is converted into spectacle or intellectual conquest.

Modern culture often treats wonder as aesthetic fuel: the thrill of a new image, a new fact, a new cosmic scale, followed by the demand for immediate explanation. That is not wonder; it is consumption. It still serves mastery, because the goal is to ingest and close.

The discipline of wonder is different. It is awe without capture. It is the willingness to let reality remain larger than your frame. It is the refusal to translate every encounter into a possession. Wonder says: "I do not need to own this to honor it." For a believer, wonder extends further: creation is a sign, not merely a mechanism. Wonder becomes gratitude and worship, not merely curiosity.

Practically, disciplined wonder looks like:

- Slowing down: staying with the thing longer than your explanatory impulse wants.
- Holding mystery without panic: allowing "I don't know" to be a form of reverence, not a wound to identity.
- Refusing reduction: not translating beauty, goodness, or holiness into "nothing but" explanations.
- Letting wonder lead to worship: turning awe into thanksgiving rather than into triumphalism.

Wonder also protects against despair. Totalizing models often shrink the world into mechanism and shrink the soul into futility. Wonder re-opens the world. It reminds the heart that reality is not exhausted by what we can control.

Together, these five practices form an anti-idolatrous epistemology that is not merely a theory. It is a lived posture. Prayer, confession, thanksgiving, and repentance keep the knower under God. Epistemic fasting breaks explanatory addiction. Community constraints resist private certainty. Testimony keeps speech accountable and non-totalizing. Wonder preserves awe without capture. None of these eliminates models, but together they keep models from becoming gods—and they keep the modern hunger for explanation from replacing worship.

11. Objections and Replies

A thesis as severe as "all models are structurally idolatrous" will provoke objections from every direction. That is healthy. If the argument cannot survive honest pressure, it is not worth keeping. But the deeper reason to face objections is spiritual: idol-critique is itself vulnerable to becoming an idol. Therefore objections are not merely intellectual hurdles; they are part of the discipline. They test whether this paper is seeking truth under God or merely building a new system of superiority.

What follows are five common objections and replies that keep the paper's stance intact: severe without anti-intellectualism, coherent without pretending to escape representation, and Christian without pretending to possess God.

11.1 "This is anti-science"

The objection: If models are idols, and science uses models, then your position is anti-science. You are encouraging people to distrust scientific knowledge, to retreat into religious irrationality, and to reject hard-won understanding.

The reply: The critique is not of science as careful inquiry into created regularities. The critique is of scientism—the elevation of scientific modeling into metaphysical ultimacy and moral oracle. The paper distinguishes tool-use from enthronement.

A model can be valid within a bounded domain and still be spiritually dangerous if it is given an ultimate job. The critique therefore does not say "do not model." It says "do not worship your models," and "do not allow technical success to become a worldview verdict."

In fact, the paper's discipline can strengthen science by restoring proper humility. It encourages explicit humility clauses, clear scope boundaries, and revisability. These are scientific virtues as well as spiritual safeguards. If the public treats scientific outputs as infallible scripture, that is not science; it is idolatry dressed in math.

So the reply is: this is not anti-science. It is anti-idolatry. It seeks to protect scientific work from becoming a rival religion and to protect souls from confusing method with ultimacy.

11.2 "This collapses into incoherence"

The objection: If all representation is idol-prone, then your own argument is a representation. You have already admitted the self-incrimination problem. Doesn't that mean your thesis destroys itself? Either you say nothing, or you contradict yourself.

The reply: The paper does not claim to escape representation. It claims to refuse possession. That is the difference between incoherence and discipline.

Incoherence would be: “No one can say anything true because all speech is modeling.” That is nihilism. The paper does not teach that. The paper teaches that speech must be chastened: confessional rather than sovereign, witness rather than totality, revisable rather than enthroned.

The self-incrimination problem is not a refutation; it is a built-in guardrail. It forces iconoclasm to be penitential. The thesis is not offered as an omniscient map of reality. It is offered as a warning about the idol impulse that accompanies representation. Held under vow, the thesis functions like a caution sign rather than a replacement god.

Therefore the position is coherent if it is practiced as a discipline of renunciation rather than asserted as a final worldview.

11.3 “Christianity itself has doctrines—aren’t those models?”

The objection: Christianity has creeds, doctrines, theology, and propositional claims. Those look like models. If all models are idolatry, then Christianity condemns itself or becomes impossible.

The reply: Christianity indeed uses doctrinal speech, but Christian doctrine is not meant to function as conceptual possession of God. It is meant to function as faithful confession under revelation. The distinction is not “doctrines vs models.” The distinction is “confession vs capture.”

A creed, at its best, is not a total system that exhausts God. It is a boundary of faithfulness: “This we must say; beyond this we will not pretend.” Doctrine says what must be affirmed and what must be refused in order to remain aligned with God’s self-revelation. It is therefore both positive and apophatic: it speaks truly and it denies the right to speak falsely.

When doctrine becomes idolatrous, it exhibits the same fruits as any idol: pride, contempt, coercion, and the replacement of love with correctness. The paper openly admits that theology can become idolatry. That admission does not invalidate doctrine; it calls doctrine back to its proper spiritual posture: humility, worship, and obedience.

In short: doctrines are unavoidable in any faith that makes truth claims, but doctrines must be held confessionally, not as possession. The paper’s apophatic argument is not anti-doctrine; it is anti-domestication of God.

11.4 “Without models we cannot act”

The objection: Life requires planning, decision-making, and coordination. If you distrust models, you paralyze action. In a crisis, you need frameworks. Are you advocating irresponsibility?

The reply: The paper explicitly provides a path for action: repentant instrument-use. It acknowledges that humans cannot live without representations. It does not abolish models; it places them under vow and scope.

Action becomes irresponsible not when we use models, but when we outsource moral agency to models. "The model decided" is the irresponsibility. The discipline proposed here insists on human accountability and moral ownership. Models assist prudence; they cannot replace conscience.

Moreover, bounded models are often necessary acts of stewardship. Christian life is not quietism. The paper's argument is not "do nothing." It is "act without worshiping your action tools." Use maps, but do not forget they are maps. Use explanations, but do not turn them into gods. Make decisions, but do not pretend your frameworks are ultimate.

So the reply is: this framework does not paralyze action; it purifies action by preventing technique from becoming sovereignty.

11.5 "This is just another form of pride"

The objection: Calling all models idolatry sounds like spiritual superiority. It sounds like you are claiming to see what others cannot. Isn't this just pride in iconoclast clothing—another way to feel elite?

The reply: This objection is the most important one because it targets the heart. And the paper concedes the danger: yes, iconoclasm can become pride. That is why the argument must be practiced as repentance, not as identity.

The antidote is not to abandon the critique. The antidote is to apply the critique first to oneself. If the thesis produces contempt, it has already failed. If it produces isolation, harshness, or triumphalism, it has become an idol. The fruit test applies here with full force.

True anti-idolatry produces humility, mercy, and increased accountability. It does not produce superiority. It does not produce the joy of being "above" others. It produces sobriety: "I am tempted; therefore I must watch and pray." The stance is not "I am pure." The stance is "I am in danger."

So the reply is: this can become pride, and therefore it must be held under vow, with community constraints, liturgies of humility, and readiness to repent. The presence of a risk does not refute the discipline; it defines why the discipline is necessary.

Taken together, these replies preserve the paper's posture: severe against idols, humble about its own vulnerability, and practical in its guidance. The goal is not to destroy modeling, science,

doctrine, or action. The goal is to restore the order of ultimacy: God alone is ultimate; everything else—including our best explanations—must remain a servant, never a throne.

12. Conclusion: The Refusal of Conceptual Sovereignty

The argument of this paper has been severe by design. It has treated models not as innocent aids but as spiritually hazardous objects, structurally tempted to become idols. This severity is not a rejection of intelligence or inquiry. It is a refusal of conceptual sovereignty: the human impulse to stand above reality—above God, above creation, above persons—and to claim possession by explanation. The paper's central claim is not that explanation is always wrong. It is that explanation is always morally charged. Every act of representation carries a temptation: to replace living reality with a manageable substitute, to terminate mystery by fiat, to convert tools into judges, and to treat closure as peace.

The conclusion therefore does not resolve the tension by offering a new master model called "anti-modeling." That would be the final irony: iconoclasm enthroned. Instead, the conclusion returns to the discipline that makes the whole argument livable: renunciation, humility clauses, community constraints, and fruit tests. The end is not a new system. The end is a posture: truth pursued under God, without worshiping our own frames.

12.1 Restating the thesis in one paragraph

All models—scientific, moral, political, theological—are structurally prone to idolatry because they compress reality into graspable form, and the human heart is tempted to treat what it can grasp as ultimate. This temptation becomes fatal when a model claims the right to terminate mystery, to define what exists in total, to function as an oracle over persons, or to provide existential reassurance that properly belongs to God. God cannot be modeled because God is living reality, not an object; and creation cannot be possessed either, because total representation is impossible and because systems that claim totality produce pride, despair, and victims. Iconoclasm survives its own self-incrimination only as a repentant discipline: speaking confessionally rather than sovereignly, using models as emergency tools under vow rather than as altars, and testing every framework by its fruits—humility and mercy versus contempt and closure. The central act is the refusal of conceptual sovereignty: we may use explanations, but we must not worship them.

12.2 What is gained: reverence, moral clarity, freedom from false closure

The first gain is reverence. Reverence is not anti-thought; it is right order. Reverence restores a boundary that modernity routinely erases: the distinction between tool and ultimate. When that boundary returns, both God and creation are treated with greater dignity. God is no longer

reduced to an explanatory stop; God is Lord. Creation is no longer treated as mere inventory; it becomes gift, sign, and arena of stewardship. Reverence also protects worship itself from being replaced by explanation. It preserves the living relation—prayer, obedience, thanksgiving—against the substitution of conceptual ownership.

The second gain is moral clarity. Idolatrous models often justify cruelty by appealing to system coherence. They reduce persons to categories, outsource responsibility to "the model," and demand scapegoats to keep narratives clean. Refusing conceptual sovereignty cuts across that. It puts persons back above explanations. It insists that no framework—however elegant—may erase the image of God in the neighbor. It restores accountability: human agents must own their decisions, repent when wrong, and refuse to hide behind abstractions.

The third gain is freedom from false closure. Much of modern anxiety is managed by explanatory addiction: the need to "have it" so we can feel safe. This paper names that as counterfeit peace. The practices proposed—liturgies of humility, epistemic fasting, testimony, wonder—aim to free the soul from the compulsion to close. The result is not paralysis; it is a deeper calm rooted in trust rather than in control. One can learn, investigate, and act without pretending to possess the whole. That freedom is spiritual and psychological: the ability to live inside mystery without panic and inside partial knowledge without despair.

12.3 What is risked: impracticality, miscommunication, performative purity

The paper's posture also carries real risks, and honesty requires naming them.

Impracticality is a risk, especially for those drawn to absolute iconoclasm. Silence and refusal of system-building can make coordination, teaching, and daily decision-making difficult. Communities can become inefficient or dependent on outsiders who carry the very modeling burdens they reject. Even repentant instrument-use can feel slow compared to the modern demand for instant narrative.

Miscommunication is another risk. Minimal speech can be misread as evasiveness or ambiguity. Humility clauses can be misread as weakness. Refusing total narratives can be misread as indecision. In a culture trained to equate confidence with competence, chastened speech may be socially costly.

Performative purity is the most dangerous risk because it is the paper's central temptation in a new disguise. A person can take pride in refusing models, pride in being "above" the masses who are "caught in systems," pride in austerity. Or a community can become sectarian—brittle, suspicious, and harsh—because purity has replaced love. These risks do not invalidate the discipline; they define why the discipline must remain repentant. The fruit test applies here: if iconoclasm produces contempt, it has already become an idol.

12.4 Forward work: a disciplined Reference section and further case studies

The forward work is twofold: documentation and application.

First, a disciplined Reference section is not an afterthought; it is part of the moral architecture of the paper. References should be curated to support the paper's careful distinctions: model versus ultimacy, science versus scientism, doctrine versus possession, witness versus system. The Reference section should include sources in theology (apophatic traditions and critiques of idolatry), philosophy of science (limits of modeling, underdetermination, scope and inference), sociology of knowledge (how prestige and institutions shape belief), and moral theology or ethics (how systems produce scapegoats and dehumanization). The goal is not to build an academic fortress but to demonstrate accountable speech: claims that can be examined rather than merely asserted.

Second, further case studies are essential because idolatry is contextual. The paper has examined cosmology and political-moral frameworks, but the pattern repeats elsewhere: in medicine (risk scores and triage as moral authority), in economics (markets as providence), in AI (models as oracles and the worship of prediction), in psychology (diagnostic categories replacing persons), and in church life (systems of doctrine replacing prayer and love). Each case study should apply the same discipline: identify the move from tool to ultimacy, name the category error, and propose repair practices that restore persons and worship above explanation.

The paper ends, then, not with a new theory to possess, but with a vow to practice: to use words without enthroning them, to use models without worshiping them, to pursue truth without claiming sovereignty, and to keep God—not explanation—at the center. The refusal of conceptual sovereignty is not the end of thinking. It is the beginning of thinking under God.

References

R1 Apophatic and iconoclastic strands in Christian theology

- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. The Mystical Theology; The Divine Names (apophatic "unsaying" as theological discipline).
- Gregory of Nyssa. The Life of Moses (ascent by darkness; knowing without possession).
- Augustine. Confessions; De Trinitate (idolatry of the heart; God beyond conceptual containment).
- John of Damascus. On the Divine Images (classical defense of icons; distinction between veneration and worship).
- The Seventh Ecumenical Council (Second Council of Nicaea, 787). Acts and definitions (icon veneration and the logic of representation).
- Maximus the Confessor. Ambigua; Mystagogy (participation, mystery, and the limits of conceptual grasp).
- Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologiae (especially on analogical predication; what language about God can and cannot do).
- Martin Luther. Large Catechism (First Commandment: what you fear/love/trust is your god); Heidelberg Disputation (theology of the cross vs glory).
- John Calvin. Institutes of the Christian Religion (the heart as idol factory; the limits of human "imagination" about God).
- Vladimir Lossky. The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church (apophatic theology and the refusal of conceptual capture).
- Denys Turner. The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism (negative theology as rigorous restraint, not vagueness).
- Jean-Luc Marion. God Without Being (God not reducible to "being" as an object of metaphysics).
- Andrew Louth. The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition (apophatic lineage and spiritual epistemology).
- Rowan Williams. On Christian Theology (modern retrieval of patristic restraint and worship-shaped knowing).

R2 Philosophy of models, representation, and underdetermination

- Pierre Duhem. The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory (theory-ladenness; limits of decisive tests).
- W. V. Quine. “Two Dogmas of Empiricism”; Word and Object (holism and underdetermination themes).
- Bas van Fraassen. The Scientific Image (constructive empiricism; model success vs metaphysical claims).
- Nancy Cartwright. How the Laws of Physics Lie (idealization; the gap between laws and world).
- Mary Hesse. Models and Analogies in Science (analogical reasoning; representational limits).
- Ronald N. Giere. Explaining Science; Science Without Laws (models as instruments, not mirrors).
- Mary S. Morgan and Margaret Morrison (eds.). Models as Mediators (models as “in-between” structures linking theory and world).
- Roman Frigg and Stephan Hartmann. “Models in Science,” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (survey of model kinds and representational strategies).
- Michael Weisberg. Simulation and Similarity (how similarity claims work; why models always omit).
- Eric Winsberg. Science in the Age of Computer Simulation (simulation epistemology; validation limits).
- Naomi Oreskes, Kristin Shrader-Frechette, and Kenneth Belitz. “Verification, Validation, and Confirmation of Numerical Models in the Earth Sciences” (why “verification” is not what many think).
- George E. P. Box and Norman R. Draper. Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces (often cited for “all models are wrong, but some are useful,” and the practical ethos behind it).
- Thomas S. Kuhn. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (paradigms, inference culture, and what counts as explanation).

R3 Critiques of scientism and "totalizing explanation"

- Mikael Stenmark. Scientism: Science, Ethics and Religion (a direct taxonomy of scientism and its claims).
- Susan Haack. Defending Science—Within Reason; and essays on "scientism" (the difference between respecting science and absolutizing it).
- Mary Midgley. Science as Salvation (scientific "myths" as cultural replacements for religion).
- Michael Polanyi. Personal Knowledge; The Tacit Dimension (knowing exceeds formalization; personal responsibility in inquiry).
- Edmund Husserl. The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology (scientific success vs loss of meaning).
- Max Weber. "Science as a Vocation" (limits of science regarding value and meaning).
- C. S. Lewis. The Abolition of Man (the reduction of value to technique; technocratic moral drift).
- Jacques Ellul. The Technological Society (technique as a quasi-religion of control).
- Neil Postman. Technopoly (the cultural worship of technique and quantification).
- Alasdair MacIntyre. After Virtue (managerial "expertise" and the erosion of moral tradition).
- Charles Taylor. A Secular Age (how modern "immanent frames" become total stories).
- Hans Jonas. The Imperative of Responsibility (technology, power, and moral scope beyond technique).
- Stephen Toulmin. Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity (modern rationality as a cultural project with costs).

R4 Spiritual disciplines: humility, confession, and discernment

- The Rule of St. Benedict (stability, humility, and ordered life as anti-idolatrous formation).
- Ignatius of Loyola. The Spiritual Exercises (discernment, examen, and humility against self-deception).
- John Cassian. Conferences (formation of attention; diagnosing inner compulsions).

- Evagrius Ponticus. Praktikos (watchfulness; naming temptations that masquerade as virtue).
- Thomas a Kempis. The Imitation of Christ (anti-status spirituality; lowliness against "having it").
- Teresa of Avila. The Interior Castle (prayer as non-possessive knowing and transformation).
- John of the Cross. The Dark Night of the Soul (purification of attachments, including conceptual ones).
- Jonathan Edwards. Religious Affections (discernment by fruits; counterfeit spirituality diagnostics).
- Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Life Together (community as accountability against private certainty).
- Richard J. Foster. Celebration of Discipline (practices that re-order trust and desire).
- Dallas Willard. The Spirit of the Disciplines; Renovation of the Heart (training the inner life against control addictions).
- Andrew Murray. Humility (humility as a positive spiritual technology, not mere self-negation).
- Henri J. M. Nouwen. The Way of the Heart (silence, solitude, prayer as resistance to performative selfhood).

R5 Case-study sources: cosmology, inference culture, and public rhetoric

Cosmology and dark matter (technical anchors)

- Fritz Zwicky (1930s). Early cluster-mass inference introducing "missing mass" reasoning.
- Vera Rubin and collaborators (1970s–1980s). Galaxy rotation curves and mass discrepancy evidence.
- Clowe, Bradac, Gonzalez, et al. (2006). Bullet Cluster gravitational lensing as a prominent line of evidence in the dark-matter vs modified-gravity debate.
- Planck Collaboration (2018 results; published 2019–2020). Precision cosmological parameters within Lambda-CDM.
- WMAP Collaboration (nine-year results, 2013). Independent CMB parameter constraints.
- Steven Weinberg. Cosmology (textbook-level synthesis; assumptions made explicit).

- Scott Dodelson. Modern Cosmology (model-based inference and parameter estimation culture).
- P. J. E. Peebles. Principles of Physical Cosmology (classical foundations and interpretive framing).

Inference culture (how models become “authoritative”)

- E. T. Jaynes. Probability Theory: The Logic of Science (Bayesian inference as disciplined reasoning, not oracle).
- Gelman, Carlin, Stern, Dunson, Vehtari, Rubin. Bayesian Data Analysis (how inference works, where it fails).
- Lewis and Bridle (2002). Cosmological parameter estimation tools (illustrative of pipeline-centered inference).
- David J. C. MacKay. Information Theory, Inference, and Learning Algorithms (inference as compression; clarity about assumptions).
- Literature on model selection, identifiability, and uncertainty quantification (for how “fit” can be over-read culturally).

Public rhetoric and “explanations as sermons” (examples and counterweights)

- Stephen Hawking. A Brief History of Time (cosmology as public metaphysics in popular form).
- Brian Greene. The Elegant Universe (aestheticized explanation culture).
- Lawrence M. Krauss. A Universe from Nothing (a well-known example of metaphysical extrapolation from physics).
- Sean Carroll. The Big Picture (explicit worldview-building from scientific frame).
- John Horgan. The End of Science (limits-of-explanation discourse and its temptations).
- George Ellis and Joseph Silk (2014). Essays on testability and the integrity of physics (the boundary between physics and metaphysical storytelling).

The author has published over 4,700 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.